



Blackie & Son Limited
Private Library

Case *60* Shelf *2*

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HISTORY
OF THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
AND OF THE
NINETEENTH
TILL THE OVERTHROW OF THE FRENCH EMPIRE.
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
MENTAL CULTIVATION AND PROGRESS.

By F. C. SCHLOSSER,
PRIVY COUNCILLOR AND PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF
HEIDELBERG.

TRANSLATED, WITH A PREFACE AND NOTES,

By D. DAVISON, M.A.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
CHAPMAN AND HALL, 186 STRAND.

1844.

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND JOHN E. TAYLOR.
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER V.—(*continued.*)

GERMANY TILL THE BEGINNING OF THE SEVENTH DECENNIUM OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

	Page
SECT. II.—Letters upon Literature.—First Years of the Universal German Library.—Herder's Fragments for the promotion of German Literature.—Wieland.—Von Thümmel	1
SECT. III.—Lavater.—Basedow	24
SECT. IV.—Lessing	41

PART THE SECOND.

PROGRESS AND NATURE OF INTELLECTUAL IMPROVEMENT AND LITERATURE.

CHAPTER I.

ENGLAND.

SECT. I.—Novels and Humour	57
SECT. II.—Origin and History of the so-called English Blue Stockings	64
SECT. III.—Robertson—Hume—Gibbon	73
SECT. IV.—Political Writers and Speakers of the time of the American War	87

CHAPTER II.

FRANCE.

SECT. I.—Diderot—Marmontel—Raynal	113
SECT. II.—Rousseau—Buffon	130
SECT. III.—Philosophical Political Economists and Politicians . .	152

CHAPTER III.

GERMAN LITERATURE IN RELATION TO PUBLIC AND DOMESTIC
LIFE, TO THE TONE OF SOCIETY, AND PREVAILING CUSTOMS.

	Page
SECT. I.—Philosophy and Theology in the German Schools and Universities, till the introduction of Kant's Philosophy into two German Universities.	
A.—Philosophy	171
B.—Theology	185
SECT. II.—Basedow and the Philosophical Institutions at Dessau, Marschlinz and Heidesheim.—C. F. Bahrdt, and his translation of the Bible.—J. A. Eberhardt, and his Apology of Socrates ..	196
SECT. III. A.—Nicolai and the 'Universal German Library.'—Wieland, the Brothers Jacobi, and the 'German Mercury.' ..	216
SECT. III. B.—Göttingen Bards.—Idylls.—Sensibility.—Tenderness in German Life.—Werther.—Siegwart.—Campe.—Salzmann.—Pestalozzi.—Novel Manufactories	231
SECT. IV.—Lessing and Herder.—Intelligible and Poetic Christianity.—Lavater and Lichtenberg.—Fanaticism and Satire ..	261
SECT. V.—History.—Journalism.—Political Economy.	
A.—History	309
B.—Relation of Writers to Governments.—Journalism.—Political Economy	324
APPENDIX.—Alphabetical List of the Authors mentioned in the Sections upon German Literature	355

ERRATA IN VOLUME II.

- Page 4, l. 12, *for* stiffly, *read* stiff
 — 8, l. 6, *dele* inverted commas *before* the *and* *place them before* "from the Hebrew"
 — 10, l. 11 from bottom, *for* bread, *read* exhalations of
 — 14, l. 19, *dele* ;
 — 17, note, *read* as a specimen of that peculiar sort of breath &c.
 — 53, l. 14, *dele* was
 — 58, l. 12 from bottom, *after* did *insert* they
 — 60, l. 4 from bottom, *for* from, *read* in
 — 71, l. 18, *for* Musical Doctor, *read* Mus. Doc.
 — 134, l. 11, *transpose* affairs administrative
 — 175, line 8, *dele* *for*
 — 205, l. 4 and 3 from bottom, *for* Germany. After—Salzmann, *read* Germany, after—Salzmann ;
 — 228, l. 3 from bottom, *for* the publisher openly calls Wieland, *read* Wieland openly calls the publisher
 — 230, l. 11, *for* Edwin, *read* Erwin
 — 248, l. 24, *for* Ziegra. He, *read* Ziegra—he

HISTORY

OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

CHAPTER V.—(*continued.*)

GERMANY TILL THE BEGINNING OF THE SEVENTH DECENNIUM OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

§ II.

LETTERS UPON LITERATURE.—FIRST YEARS OF THE UNIVERSAL GERMAN LIBRARY.—HERDER'S FRAGMENTS FOR THE PROMOTION OF GERMAN LITERATURE.—WIELAND.—VON THÜMMEL.

WE have mentioned in the preceding volume, that two attempts had been made in the sixth decennium to erect a critical tribunal in Berlin or Leipzig, and that Weisse, who at last remained alone at the head of the undertaking of the library of the fine arts, did not possess a sufficient share of the public confidence, under the then circumstances, to undertake the dictatorship. This dictatorship was then at Nicolai's wish and suggestion and with his assistance transferred to the 'Letters upon Literature,' which were expressly destined to place the whole uneducated public in Germany, who were only accustomed to miserable German books, in a condition to distinguish by sure signs the bad from the middling, and these again from the excellent. This was Lessing's and Nicolai's object when they renewed their early attempt to establish a formal tribunal of criticism over that part of literature which did not merely concern the learned, but which affected the whole people. The new critical journal, which Nicolai, in his double capacity of bookseller and friend of the reformation of literature and men, erected, may be regarded as consisting of two altogether different halves; the one formed a collection of judgements pronounced by Lessing and his friends upon German literature; the other a speculation

of Nicolai's. The title of this journal, which appeared from 1759—1763, is 'Letters relating to the Newest Literature,' and the work appeared to all so important for our literature, that a new edition was published in twenty-four parts from 1761—1766.

The chief contributors to this critical journal, who, by this work, rendered services to literature which are now universally recognised, but were then often undervalued, were Lessing, Nicolai, and Mendelssohn, for what was afterwards written by Grillo, Abbt, and Resewitz, can bear no comparison with the earlier contributions. Sulzer only sent one paper; he did not indeed belong to those whom we call reformers, for he had adopted Bodmer as his model of perfection. The new tribunal, indeed, could raise no barrier against that mediocrity which boasted of the number of its readers; but the public at least learned, that the wares, which had been hitherto praised as genuine, were altogether falsified and debased. This information was even necessary for a Möser with respect to Dusch, for he had felt no scruple in placing this poor wight in the same rank with Cervantes and Molière. Dusch, whose 'Burgheim Family,' 'Carl Ferdiner,' and other novels were also several times reprinted in the following decennium, was the chief writer, poet and translator of Lower Germany, and honoured and pensioned by the king of Denmark. For this reason Lessing directed all his attacks especially against him, in order that people in Germany might learn that they had as yet no literature. Moreover, the critics in these letters, at the same time, exemplified by their style and language how others ought to write.

A great cry was immediately raised against the severity of the new critics, and we shall see from the example of Wieland, how beneficial this severity in the existing circumstances was. By the severe criticism which was directed against him in these 'Letters,' by the bitter and well-founded reproaches against his hypoeritical sensibility and cant, and his dramatic attempts which could lead to nothing, Wieland was driven to adopt a new species of writing, in which he became the favourite of the nation. The critics, particularly Lessing, perceived Wieland's talents and capacities; they only censured their application, and Wieland himself shows, though accompanied with the manifestation of great dislike to the Berlin critics, that they understood their business well. In his 'Letters' indeed he calls them *Frérons*,

by way of nickname, because Voltaire universally, in prose and verse, represented his critic Fréron as a knave; but he feels and shows at the same time, that he is afraid of their condemnation. He says in a letter dated January 1792:—

“I take the Berliners, so far as I am acquainted with them, to be people well qualified to be Frérons. They have wit, reading and malice enough for their office. I should be very glad to be free from quarrels with these gentlemen, but for some years I have been involved in the transaction of my Zürich friends without lending them aid,” &c. The consequence was, that Wieland separated from his Zürich friends, and was then vehemently railed at by them and the whole class of persons of sensibility, when he returned from the regions of seraphim to human life and nature, and from the Platonic republic to Biberach and Weimar. By means of these sheets Lessing would also have gladly recalled Klopstock from angels and tears, from lamentation, devotion and dogmatics, to epic truth, to the joys of life, and to vigorous activity, but this he dare not venture in these times, and what he suggests or blames in the ‘Messiah’ only relates to the form.

The critics prove, by the manner in which they introduce their opponent Hamann to the public, that they knew well how to distinguish, both in literature and history, fruitless imitation and false mysticism from the fanaticism of genius, and the spirited conception of religious principle in the human soul. Klopstock’s weak imitator, I. A. Kramer, and his very affecting and affected attachment, were treated with great severity, and the nakedness of the school exposed; F. C. von Moser, how much soever his patriotic efforts were commended, with his gloomy and tasteless mysticism, was assailed with understanding and wit; whereas Hamann, notwithstanding the mysticism of his nature, the obscurity of his thoughts, and the singularity of his style, was greeted with rejoicing as a light of genius bursting out in the midst of prevailing obscurity.

One of Lessing’s main objects, which, as we shall afterwards show, he happily succeeded in attaining by his dramaturgy, was to lead his nation from the French and their rhetorical poetry to the English and to their originality, because there was a total want of vigour in Germany, in life as well as in every species of literature. By means of the ‘Letters upon Literature,’ Shakspeare was first made known in Germany as a renowned poet,

whom Wieland afterwards, although badly enough, helped to clothe in a German dress. Poetry was thereby at least freed from dulness; and in prose also writers were compelled by criticism to adopt a new tone. Lessing and his friends proved by their spirited and clever criticism, written in pure German, that there was another way which lies between the pedantic and unwieldy style of the schools, the dull prose of the Gottsched party, and the pious whining of the admirers of Klopstock's poetry. Mendelssohn did not turn his attention to fine writing or to style, but in his contributions to the 'Letters upon Literature' he appeared as the antagonist of that philosophy, which was then treated in the so-called mathematical method, stiffly, spiritless and repulsive, not only in the rostrum and in compendia but also in writings destined for general use. The example which Lessing and Mendelssohn had given, in the treatise mentioned in the preceding volume, viz. 'Pope a Metaphysician,' had been followed by no writer, and the 'Letters upon Literature' therefore encouraged every attempt to bring our philosophy from the schools into the affairs of life.

All the before-mentioned writers, with the exception of Michaelis and Semler, were made known in the whole of Germany, especially by the 'Letters upon Literature,' and at later period, by this same instrumentality, Hamann, Winkelmann and Kant were first recommended as men of distinguished talents. From the way in which these men were treated in these 'Letters,' we see most clearly, that the Berlin periodical can in no respect be considered as one of our common reviews, but that the authors sometimes wished to advance every manifestation of genius, and sometimes showed the possession of a fine tact in distinguishing true merit from what was only apparent. However severe Hamann's tone against the Berlin reviewers was, however vehement his opposition, however fine and cutting his censure of their one-sided enlightenment, whose source was not in the life of the people, this did not prevent the authors of the 'Letters' from announcing to the whole of Germany, that their native land and their literature stood in great need of such men as he, notwithstanding the strangeness of his manner and the peculiarity of his language. Hamann's writing, alas! had taken such a direction* as early as 1766, that he became altogether inaccessible

* The 'Socratic Memoirs,' collected by a favourer of Ennui, with a double address to 'Nobody and to Two.' 1759. In the title we already perceive the

to the great public, and continued influential only in connexion with the greatest writers, to whom he was useful by his criticism and counsel.

The second of the men who have been mentioned, Winkelmann, was not indeed clear according to the French manner, nor broad and diffuse according to the German; neither was he obscure like Hamann. He wrote in a noble and vigorous style, required to be studied in order to be understood, but well repaid the labour. His writings were therefore not only praised and recommended† to the Germans, by the Berliners, who, together with their king, often laid by far too great a value upon French light, but also by their opponents, at whose head stood Hamann. Kant had only written (at this time) some short treatises, but the ‘Letters upon Literature’ speedily caused him to be greeted as one of the very few writers who were able to propound new and great thoughts in vigorous and dignified, if not in an altogether beautiful and clear language‡.

The effect of these letters suggested to the speculative Nicolai the thought of entering upon a great undertaking, like that of

unfortunate humorous mysticism. Hamann then directed his attacks against the principles, according to which Mendelssohn had reviewed Rousseau’s ‘Heloise in Five Letters’ in the ‘Letters upon Literature,’ and also against the tone and manner (as he called it) of the Berlin literati and the French Encyclopædists. These attacks were made in his ‘Abälardum Virbium,’ in the supplement of the tenth part of the ‘Letters upon Literature,’ and Fulberti Kuhlmann’s answer to ‘Abälardum Virbium.’ These witty pieces are among the clearest of his confused Sybil sheets. Moses Mendelssohn caused these papers written against himself to be printed, on account of his notion of their importance to German literature. The Berlin people also introduced into their journal, word for word, his witty judgement upon his friend Moser’s ‘Master and Servant,’ and published his miscellaneous observations upon the ‘Syntax of the French Language.’ ‘The Clouds,’ a farce in the ‘Socratic Memoirs,’ cum notis varior. in usum Delph. 1761. Altona; and ‘The Crusade of the Philologist,’ 1762, prove that he wished to introduce mysticism into Germany, i.e. to take owls to Athens and carry water to the sea.

† Before Winkelmann had been in Italy he wrote ‘Thoughts on Imitation of the Works of the Greeks in Painting and Sculpture,’ (1756). Next, (in 1761) ‘Remarks upon the Architecture of the Ancients.’ In the following year, a ‘Letter Missive upon the Discoveries in Herculanæum.’ In 1763, his ‘Treatise upon the Power of the Perception and Feeling of the Beautiful in Art, and upon Instruction therein.’ Then (1764) the two parts of his ‘History of Art in Ancient Times,’ and (1767) ‘Remarks upon the History of Art in Ancient Times.’

‡ To this period belong Kant’s ‘Only possible Argument for a Demonstration of the Existence of God,’ his ‘Proof of the False Subtlety of the four syllogistic Figures,’ and, finally, his ‘Attempt to introduce the Notion of negative Greatness into Philosophy.’

the French Encyclopædists, in order to profit by the powerful movement in Germany, and wholly to shake off the fetters of the olden times, and to extend, at the same time, the new light to all the departments of science. This was the occasion of founding the 'Universal German Library.'

The new critical institution in Berlin continued for twenty years to be regarded as an oracle, and the decisions of this tribunal, in all departments of literature, were final; and yet Nicolai himself, in his prefatory notice to the first part, in 1765, acknowledges that the undertaking was commenced properly as a bookseller's speculation, but he adds, that he had at the same time so taken his measures, that German literature must necessarily be materially promoted by the new criticism. Lessing appears sometimes to have regarded the undertaking as a mere speculation, and sometimes as a Berlin party affair, for he never took any share in it. This work was doubly useful, because its pages were open only to the progressive and enlightenment party, and praised them alone, first by its own influence, and secondly by the lively opposition which it excited, in a time of great movement and striving after freedom, against the often dull liberalism of the 'Library,' against the oppression which was exercised by means of this institution of the powerful and united party of Nicolai, and against the critical despotism of these oracular condemnations of the Berliners. This opposition extended to all corners and ends of Germany, and sprung from some of our most distinguished and original men.

Nicolai himself, not exactly in the commencement, but particularly in the introduction to the second piece of the eighth part, gives a long statement of his views and prospects; we shall however only bring forward this single fact, that it was a great benefit to our nation, that, by means of the 'Library,' such men as Klotz should have been wholly driven away from the critical judgement-seat. This shameless charlatan, up to this time, in his 'Halle Journals,' had poured out the most unmerited abuse in the coarsest and most vulgar language, and had showered his praises in the most unjustifiable manner, till he began his struggle with Lessing and Herder, by whom he was utterly annihilated. Klotz therefore also immediately appeared as the opponent of this powerful tribunal, but his weapons were unfit for the task, and it remained wholly uninjured by his assaults. We shall not here enter into the particulars of this strife; who-

ever wishes to become acquainted with it will find an account of it in the preface to the second piece of the fourth and eighth volumes of the 'Library.' The opposition of Jacobi, Herder, Hamann, and afterwards of the Göttingen bards, to the Berlin critics, proved of much greater account than the vulgar abuse of Klotz.

It was however the good fortune of a man so highly esteemed as Nicolai to secure the aid and contributions of the most enlightened and most learned men in Germany for his 'Library.' He himself boasts of the support which he received from Heyne and Kästner, and ascribes the reputation which his 'Library,' in its first years, enjoyed, to their solid and careful criticism, as well as to the scientific labours of Mendelssohn and some others. It became afterwards, indeed, a kind of manufactory, because the number of contributors, which at first only amounted to fifty (where were so many heads capable of sound judgement to be found?), ultimately grew to a hundred and thirty; but this very circumstance gave a still greater importance to the new institution which was intended to bring about a revolution in literature, which, like all other revolutions, cannot be carried through without the people. The workmen were chosen with all the worldly wisdom of a bookseller, in order to bring the work into general circulation; their contributions had all this tendency, and when they had it not, it was given them by Nicolai. He was not only bookseller, publisher, and editor of the 'Universal German Library,' but he looked through all the reviews, altered, corrected and corresponded with the reviewers about the manner in which he wished the reviews and alterations to be made. This correspondence, and the manner in which he treated many of his assistants, gave occasion to the greatest dissatisfaction.

At this time a single man came forward as an opponent of the 'Criticism of the Letters upon Literature and the Universal Library,' who, from this moment till the end of the century, maintained a place among our best poets and prose writers. Herder possessed all the qualities which hitherto had been found most deficient in German writers; and we must here give him a place especially, because he took the German humour, fanaticism and redundancy under his protection, in opposition to Nicolai and Wieland, without at the same time dogmatising like Klopstock or raving like the Petrarchists of that time. This new critic, upon his own showing, had indisputably more imagination

than practical understanding, more variety than solidity of knowledge, more fire than massive strength; as a prose writer, therefore, he continually betrays the poet, and unites by means of fancy what the understanding is accustomed to separate.

Herder was known as a scholar as early as 1762, by a poem whose nature will readily be guessed at by "the addition from the Hebrew." He was a friend of Hamann when a student in Königsberg, and took a very peculiar direction, and that entirely different from the prevailing one in Germany. Whilst he lived in Liefland his mind and character were formed in a manner best suited to his peculiarities, by his study of 'Ossian' and the oldest English and Scotch poets, and finally by an intimate acquaintance with Shakespeare. The universality of Herder's knowledge, his study of the poets of all nations, his intimate acquaintance with Hebrew, Greek and Latin literature, well qualified him to come forward on his side as a judge of art, and adviser of the German nation, and to point out the manner in which they might advance and elevate their literature. This gave him confidence enough to publish his 'Fragments upon German Literature,' of which the first and second collection appeared in 1767. He was modest enough only to call his critical and instructive sheets an appendix to the 'Letters upon Literature,' but they were manifestly intended as an antidote against Nicolai's half of the production; that they were directed against the 'Universal German Library,' and against Klotz's 'Library of the Fine Arts,' he takes no pains to conceal.

These Fragments have not to do with single books, like the 'Letters upon Literature,' but treat of language and the art of poetry in general, and opinions and criticisms upon single works are here and there interspersed. Herder, in these writings, already employs the same language of a spirited observer which afterwards continued peculiar to him; he gives laws, views, prospects, expectations and comparisons. The titles of the particular subdivisions will immediately show with how much genius he had conceived the subject on which he wished to treat. One subdivision comprehends 'Remarks upon Language,' another, 'Literature of the Greeks,' a third, 'Roman Literature,' and a fourth was to treat of 'Eastern Literature.' Three collections of these fragments appeared under this title, and a fourth was afterwards published separately under the title of 'The Oldest Records of the Human Race.'

The form, language, manner, the fine, noble and easy tone of writing, was so new, surprising and attractive in Germany, where people had only been accustomed to dull breadth, to solid seriousness, or to babbling loquacity, that the pretensions of the young man, which were somewhat too boldly put forward, were altogether overlooked. The first edition was immediately absorbed, and a new one called for in 1768. As we are neither writing a treatise upon taste nor upon general history, we can only consider this first important work of Herder's in its connexion with the progress of our culture and mental improvement, and in this relation we must first think of the language. This is calculated for a very different public from that of the incomparable language of Lessing. It is not less noble in its way, although it is less vigorous, but it wears a quite different character. Lessing requires a serious reader, who is accustomed to consecutive logical proof; Herder one who is easily moved, desultory and less in search of information than entertainment; but he is free from all those blots which disfigured Wieland's language, which is, indeed, clear, easy and touching, but impure and always suggests its French models.

After the appearance of the 'Fragments,' in which Herder proved how well he understood to moderate censure and to bestow praise with intelligence and prudence, in which he made criticism merely an accessory, and philosophical and literary remarks his primary object, he was regarded, with good reason, as the first prose writer; because Lessing had not then written his master-pieces of German prose, and Klopstock was unfortunate in the choice of his materials. The nation would have gained just as little by the rules which he delivers with great confidence, as they had gained by so many other theories; but his examples, his mode of exposition, which was so superior to the dry manner of Sulzer and others, opened an entirely new path. In order to show in what way Herder introduced an entirely new kind of criticism and language to the public, we shall quote some passages in which he passes a judgement upon individual well-known writers, which will also prove the relation in which his book stands to the 'Letters upon Literature,' and how very different his mode of exposition, style, tone and language, are far from anything which was previously known in Germany.

We altogether pass over his remarks on the nature of our

language, because he did not possess that now almost universally disseminated knowledge of the most remarkable pieces of ancient German literature, and of the grammatical principles deduced from it; we shall only dwell upon the conclusion of the section in which he pronounces his judgement with respect to the writers of his time. His opinions with respect to Winkelmann, Hagedorn, Moser, Abbt, Spalding, Moses Mendelssohn, Lessing and Hamann, are stated at considerable length. In reference to Moser's 'Master and Servant' he makes this admirable remark: "The minister too obviously dictates, the philosopher has not time enough to digest, and the writer not leisure enough himself to write and arrange." His criticism upon his friend Hamann is so original, that it is the best source from which we can obtain a knowledge of the peculiarity and nature of the new style. He never suspected, indeed, that such a style as Hamann's could ever become fashionable in Germany; a style in which the most heterogeneous materials are mixed, in which we find the wondrous and the sad, and presently the jesting and the foolish,—a manner which was called humorous, but which was more properly mad; and least of all that such a style and manner could be brought into vogue in France, and that by Jean Paul Richter. Of Hamann he says:—

"Whoever does not regard him as a constellation must at least look upon him as a meteor, and he still continues a phenomenon in the peculiarities of our language. The substance of his writings contains many seeds of great truths, new observations, and evidences of extensive reading; the work is a laboriously wrought web of pithy expressions, allusions, and figures of speech*." The immediate commencement of the second sec-

* Herder's works upon 'Fine Writing and Art,' 1st part, p. 97, contains, in the notes, a number of illustrations of this judgement upon the writings of Hamann, of which we give one or two examples:—"He has read much and with taste; but the balsam breath from the ætherial table of the ancients, mingled with some vapours of French and with the bread of British humour, have become a cloud around him. His reading has been fused together in an unreadable form, like a piece written upon loose and unconnected paper; and if indeed a little nearer notice of the passage in which he comments would unriddle, but also betray much, I myself, who belong to the stupid readers of his writings, am not in a condition here to give guesses for principles." "Had our present adventurous Socrates had an Aspasia to express his thoughts, and an Alcibiades to improve them, he might perhaps have had disciples and followers, till perhaps in the third generation, an Aristotle, Socratis et Platonis pejor progenies (may God forgive Herder for that!), had established a system in philology of which his grandfather had never thought."

tion, which is occupied with remarks upon Greek literature and its imitation in Germany, and in which he seeks to disseminate new ideas of genius and of its awakening among us, is particularly remarkable, because the new German literature was founded upon these ideas immediately after the appearance of the 'Fragments.' He immediately afterwards passes on to give his judgement upon the services which had been rendered, partly by the Swiss and partly by Klopstock, in an assumed Eastern or Greek manner, and which he held to be surpassingly excellent and inimitable. How much Herder on the one side, and Lessing on the other, were superior to all their contemporaries, and with how much prudent foresight both were obliged to act, is apparent from these judgements, which the reader can easily refer to and discover for himself in works in such circulation as those of Herder. We shall only touch upon some points, and give a few short passages in the text or in the notes, in order to make it obvious how important Herder's appearance in public life must have been, and how useful his criticism in the then condition of things, and in the ascendancy of French prejudices.

Klopstock's *Messiah*, the chief work of that time, whose admirers, without any consideration, had classed it along with the epics of Homer, Virgil and Tasso, and which no one ventured even in the least to censure, is here carefully and minutely examined and reviewed. The examination is represented under the modest form of a dialogue between a rabbi and a Christian, and Herder attributes many excellences to Klopstock's dogmatic epic work, which would now rarely if at all be acknowledged; and yet at that time every one raised an outcry against the severity and harshness of the sentence. We shall give the brief conclusion, from which it will be seen that the judgement then pronounced has been fully confirmed in every relation, by time. He says:—"In Klopstock everything is beautiful in parts, very beautiful, but in the whole there is no just epic spirit*." The chief matter has been given in the section upon Homer and

* In his 'Treatise on Fine Writing and Art,' part ii, p. 53. At p. 51 he puts the following words into the mouth of his rabbi:—"Klopstock should, in general, according to the national opinions, have paid more attention to the poetical sense of the Old Testament, and to the taste of that age. He could not satisfy your orthodoxy: why has he not departed a few steps farther from it for the sake of poetry? Tell me, Christian! in a word, for what does Klopstock's *Messiah* suffer? In a word? You are indeed in a dilemma! his suffering before God is not to me sufficiently sensibly perceptible, and yet this is the chief point of his poem."

Klopstock, but viewed from another side; he then passes on to lyric poetry, in which, in his section upon Pindar and Dithyrambics, he expresses himself too mildly against the weak attempts of his contemporaries to produce something of the higher lyric species. In the section upon Gleim and Anacreon he opposes the whole Gleim fraternity, and denies him the title of the German Anacreon; but willingly confers upon him the honourable name of the German Tyrtæus, on account of his songs of a Prussian grenadier. We shall delay for a moment upon the section Theocritus and Gessner, in order to complete the proof of the soundness and importance of Herder's criticisms which we have deduced from his opinions formed and expressed with respect to Klopstock.

Herder's sound understanding and free thought led him, in the case of Gessner, to go directly in opposition to the opinions of the captivated age, and even to those of the 'Letters upon Literature,' and in his decision on this subject he wholly turns aside from Ramler, whom he highly esteems, and from his germanized Batteux. He commends indeed what Ramler had commended; he praises Gessner's language, and that ease and facility of expression which was very uncommon amongst his countrymen; but he proves admirably and indisputably, that neither true poetry, nature, nor invention was to be found in the affected sentimentality of these pastorals. Below we shall quote the praise as well as the censure, in order to comprehend it more easily*. The third collection, which treats of Roman and German literature, is introduced by some admirable remarks upon the system of Latin instruction, at that time pursued in the schools. These remarks had so much the greater

* In page 131, he says of Gessner:—"His shepherds are all innocent, not because innocence is the consequence of their training, but because they live in a condition of innocence; they are mere masks of shepherds—no real faces—shepherds but not men. Instead of acting and employing themselves, they sing and kiss, drink and plant gardens. In this Gessner is more fortunate than in his 'Pieces upon Kitchen and Country Life,' in which he often unexpectedly gets hold of nature as of a nymph in her veil of darkness." P. 133, "I deprive Gessner of nothing of his just praise. From Ramler's Batteux I can willingly add:—"His inventions (in detail) are various, his plans regular; nothing is more beautiful than his colouring, his prose is so harmonious that we scarcely miss the verse of Theocritus." But he adds, after some commendation of his own, "Theocritus he cannot be. He can never become our teacher in the spirit of idyllic poetry—our original, and still less our only original," &c. And yet it appears to us not a little singular, that Herder classes together Sappho and Karschin.

influence, as they corresponded in point of time with the indefatigable efforts of Basedow to improve the method of school instruction in German, and incidentally also Klotz was somewhat severely handled. These observations are especially remarkable in our times, because they show us that the instruction of youth and literature was in a condition to which, if we even wished to degenerate to such a degree, we can never return: and this at least is a consolation for freer minds. The most important is, without doubt, what is said in praise of Ramler, and in commendation of the great services which he rendered to language and versification, when Herder is speaking of his odes. This eulogium in reference to Ramler's services to the progress of the new mental culture, which Göthe and his friends Lessing and Voss and theirs afterwards promoted, is the more important, because Voss was accustomed orally to acknowledge its justice, however little value he was disposed in other respects to attribute to Herder's opinions. In the following period we shall return to Herder, and now pass on to Wieland, because he, to the astonishment of the whole world, created a literature at this time which was altogether suited to the condition of our people, acceptable to the higher classes who were accustomed to French literature, and which quickly became popular, and might be regarded as classic, without however being really so.

Wieland was born to be a writer for the great public, and especially for those classes who wish to be entertained without having any of their comforts disturbed, or being placed under the necessity of thinking much or making any effort of mind. This was precisely the very class which must be suited, if a national literature was ever to be realised: this was effected by Wieland meeting this necessity, and therefore his importance and services as regards our nation and language were very great. Wieland had indisputably only great cleverness, no invention or creative mind; he was contented with the same things (which with a great mind is seldom the case) with which the mass of so-called educated people are contented; stood a few steps above them, so as to be able to instruct them; was practical, thoughtful about gain, and knew how to accommodate and use his talents according to the necessities and demands of his customers: that Lessing could never do, and he therefore also could never win certain classes. Wieland began to observe that he was likely to have but small success as a pious and visionary

writer, and at this time fell into society at Biberach with La Roche and Count Stadion, and by them and together with them was made acquainted with the wants of the so-called polite world and with their literature. Wieland had now an opportunity of completing his initiation into French literature and French taste, which he had begun to cultivate at Bern, had opportunity also of becoming acquainted with the English and Italian writings of the new period, or in other words with the productions of the eighteenth century, and took pleasure in their study. He then formed his own new productions according to these models. The literature which Wieland adopted was like the society who cultivated it, light, wanton, clever, entertaining, and sometimes sentimental; Wieland tried to hit this tone and he succeeded. In this manner that part of our nation which seriousness or science never reached, to whom Lessing was only known as a dramatist, who, living in busy indolence, stood in need of some agreeable and clever means of mental dissipation, and sought for this sometimes in society, the theatres, watering-places and ostentation, and sometimes in books and journals;—in this way was this numerous class first attracted to take any lively interest in literature.

We do not wish by any means to maintain that Wieland, from the beginning, was distinctly conscious of the aim which properly hovered before his eyes; he was probably only led by instinct, and by some obscure anticipation; at a later period however he distinctly expresses his views with regard to the creation of a taste for educated literary entertainment in Germany, in a letter to F. H. Jacobi. He says:—"Germany possesses yet no writer whom that part of the educated public who have not been at universities can read, and so long as they have none such, they can have no literature." In consequence he applied his knowledge, his industry and his great talents to create such a literature; but what a misfortune that he wished also to disfigure the Greeks for the amusement of his public, and that he pursued writing wholly as a matter of industry and gain! He had already gained his object while he was yet in Biberach, and before he went to Erfurt he was read throughout the whole of Germany, eulogised and acknowledged as a great mind and a great writer, although he himself, with a much sounder judgement than that of the public, made much more modest claims.

In order not to depart too far from the limits of the period,

the history of which we are writing, and not to dwell too long upon Wieland, we shall select a few of his writings, which he published before he left Biberach*; we shall afterwards refer especially to his influence in North Germany in the following period, when we come to speak of his residence in Erfurt and Weimar. He is remarkable for having adopted a lighter strain of poetry and prose in the following period, when a new generation, and among them Göthe and the young men of the Göttingen Bard Union, rose up in vigorous opposition against his Gallo-Greek tendencies: his writings however secured a great public even till his death. We shall begin with the prose writings which appeared at this period, because Wieland as a prose writer, however great his reputation may have been, was far inferior to Herder, Lessing, and Von Thümmel, not to speak of Göthe, Jacobi and Klinger, who were his immediate successors.

If we would properly estimate the value of Wieland's first prose writings or his novels aright, we must remember his time and his position, we must remember that Dusch, at that time, with his miserable language and poor invention, was the delight of the public; that he gained over the pedants in favour of his tedious moralities; and that Wieland could only drive a Hermes out of the field, who condescended to the dulness of his readers, rather by becoming obnoxious to the charge of incorrectness or carelessness, than by allowing his writings to be deficient in that ease and form which were suited to the taste of his readers. We have spoken of Dusch elsewhere; he could only be brought into comparison with Wieland in certain districts: we must mention Hermes at least in passing; because he also, at a later period, had secured a great public in his favour. He commenced as a writer at a time when Fielding and Richardson were read in Germany in miserable translations. His first essay was a novel with an English title, 'Miss Fanny Wilkes' (1766), of which the merit was not inconsiderable; and in a novel which immediately followed this, he sought to describe the manners, customs and character of the German middle classes. It was no fault of his that the people in the novel were so dull, their discourse so mean, their tone so bad,

* He himself says in his Letters, part iii. p. 385, that during the time of his official service in Biberach from 1760—1768, he had published, first 8 vols. 'Translations of Shakespeare,' then 'Agathon,' then 'Comic Tales,' then 'Musalion,' then as he says in order to give superstition a death wound, 'Don Sylvio von Rosalva,' then 'Idris,' and lastly the first half of the 'New Amadis.'

and their lives so vulgar; for he described what he had read and seen. We scarcely know whether we should call *Hermes' novel* 'Sophia's Journey from Memel to Saxony' a book or a rhapsody; but this we know certainly, that on its first appearance it excited a greater degree of public attention than Herder's 'Fragments,' that it was several times reprinted, and, in the last edition, was adorned with some admirable copper-plates by Geyser and Chodowiecki.

If Wieland's novels, which are written in a language which, with immaterial exceptions, may be regarded as good, and which at least have substance and value, be compared with 'Sophia's Journey,' it will immediately be seen that his contemporaries with good reason greeted him as a great writer in this department of literature. How must that society have been constituted which could find taste in the letters in 'Sophia's Journey,' some of which have nothing in them but a beginning and an end, some certain hurried adventure and improbable tales related in a broad and vulgar tone, which is sometimes artificially witty, and sometimes learned and moralising! Wieland's two novels are distinguished by a definite direction and a definite object. 'Don Sylvio von Rosalva,' which we name first of the two as a novel much read and often reprinted, is especially important to us from its relation to the circumstances of mental culture and improvement in Germany. Wieland himself declares, that he wrote this novel to inflict a death-wound upon superstition. Expressed in other words, that is to say, he wished to hold up to ridicule the absurd sentimentality, and the silly affected piety connected with it, which prevailed among the educated circles in Germany, in the same way as Cervantes had ridiculed knight-errantry in 'Don Quixote.'

The notion was very unlucky in the very beginning, to call up to the reader's remembrance the well-known work of such an original genius as Cervantes; and it was still more unlucky, that two wholly different models were followed in the composition of the novel: this was even perceived when 'Don Sylvio' was admired as a masterpiece. The intelligent regarded it as very absurd, that Wieland should (in one and the same novel) borrow the form from Cervantes and the materials from Fielding. In some passages of 'Don Sylvio' we recognise Cervantes, in some Fielding, and in others Sterne's 'Tristram Shandy;' and the greatest excellence of all the three writers here named is that

they are original and national. In the works which Wieland used, however different Cervantes, Fielding and Sterne are, the contents and form correspond, all that relates to person and place is distinct and truthful; but in 'Don Sylvio,' on the other hand, you have merely Spanish names and apparel, whilst in other respects there is nothing Spanish,—indeed it is impossible to say with certainty whether the traits are French or German. The book has no distinct or national character, but there reigns throughout a modern universality, and the remarks and reflections which gave the book great importance in its time, are very loosely connected with the events which are therein related.

The second of Wieland's novels which obtained a great reputation is 'Agathon,' which, singularly enough, contains Wieland's own, inward and thoroughly German history, in a Greek dress. As a novel, therefore, as is seen at the first glance, it is obnoxious to the same objection which has been just made to 'Don Sylvio.' What is represented as Greek is not genuine Greek, and the French and German are disfigured and scarcely to be recognised in their Grecian garb. All the latter improvements have failed to remove or much to better this fault; for the want of distinct character and of peculiar colouring in a novel can never be remedied by subsequent emendations. This work, however, was of singular value in its time for life, and the resuscitation of knowledge, which was perishing in the universities, for our language, and for the formation of the tone of the great reading public, and on these grounds it belongs to the most remarkable works of our literature. We willingly admit that the long dissertations which the book contains are wearisome; that the truth of Wieland's history is injurious to the poetry borrowed from Greece; that the Greek is neither Greek nor German; that the diffuseness*, the continually returning forms and the changes which are rung on words, and the often stupid wit†, is to us at present wearisome and repulsive.

We attach a value to the book upon quite a different ground from that on which Wieland himself valued it. Its importance consists in its struggle against Platonic visionary speculations and fashionable sensibility; for, on the one hand, it was scarcely

* We believe that nobody in our days, who has been accustomed to Göthe, Herder and others, would read the long dissertations, with their long sentences, in 'Agathon.'

† See the title of 1st ch. 8th b. A specimen of the peculiar sort of the wind, which Horace has called *aura popularis*.

worth the trouble to struggle so seriously against a fashion of the masses; and, on the other, those who had most need of being converted were precisely the very persons who thrust 'Agathon' away from them: the greater public, on the contrary, were by this novel made acquainted with the result of the new French philosophy in the most agreeable manner. Should any one inquire in what manner the doctrines of a philosophy, which has been so vehemently blamed, could be advantageous to the progress of a serious and religious nature, we answer, in Germany at that time the philosophy of schools and universities alone was cultivated,—everything was written in an artificial terminology, and systems alone were built up and explained; whoever wished to know anything about the philosophy of life, to promote sound and rational modes of thinking about the world, mankind and religion, without repeating the formularies of a German professor, without submitting to the tedium and labour of reading dry comments, must have recourse to the French.

We consider Wieland's 'Agathon,' therefore, only important in as far as it contributed to the banishment of French books from German life. Whoever, before this time, wished to know anything of practical wisdom, of worldly prudence, of the views and prospects of large classes, whoever sought to realize the great and substantial objects of life in conjunction with mental culture and improvement,—he must be thoroughly acquainted with French literature, and keep altogether remote from that of his native land: Wieland made it superfluous to ask for counsel from the French, and placed the educated in a condition to realize their objects in the shortest and most agreeable manner. In the then state of things morality lost nothing, and German literature, nationality and the approximation of classes of the same people, previously wholly separated, were eminently promoted. The wise Nicolai and his reviewers thought nothing of all this, and they applied the self-same measure of their tedious morals to every work of the poetical mind; they did the same thing at a later period, again, by 'Werther,' although they had been already laughed at and wholly unattended to, when in their reviews in the 'Universal German Library,' lib. 3, they raised an outcry against the want of moral principles in 'Agathon.'

The question was obviously not one of morality but of poetry and a freer development of thought; and it was well known, and in fact confessed, that the so-called fashionable world, the tone-

giving portion of the German public, sought and honoured the French, because their own writers persecuted them with sermons. In Wieland's 'Agathon' every thing was expounded which had been taught by the Greeks, and also all that was called the philosophy of life by the French school in an agreeable manner, though occasionally somewhat diffuse, and in easy and elegant language. It was, indeed, offensive to those who were acquainted with the subject, and to learned men (Wieland's proper public could perceive nothing of the matter), that all the Greeks, from Archytas to Hippias, must be brought into requisition in order to give the colouring of antiquity to the new French doctrines. In order to make the manner in which Wieland effected this obvious, we need only direct attention to the philosophy of Hippias, to whose house in Smyrna Agathon is brought. This philosophy, which is so fully developed in the third book, is nothing else than an admirable and clear representation of the theory of Helvetius. And this work might be used with more advantage than Helvetius's own, to explain the whole of his principles. Wieland's outline of Hippias's philosophy contains the kernel of the whole matter.

It appears to us, moreover, that Wieland, by virtue of that practical tact peculiar to him, felt himself that he was not made for a novel writer, and that impure and unequal prose could never become classic, but that the Germans had never yet made an attempt in a species of poetry, which was now the order of the day. He chose this department for himself, and immediately proved himself a master. As an author of didactic prose novels, Wieland had broken ground in a species of literature of which the Germans were previously wholly destitute, and of which they must have so remained, if they had not called in aid from abroad to supply the deficiencies of their home productions. Wieland wrote many works of this kind, which were extensively circulated and read, but in the new art of poetry he was and remained a master.

Wieland had now completely broken with the Swiss and the pietists, he had no longer any one to spare, and he was obliged to win the favour of those classes who had hitherto been accustomed to read only French books. This he accomplished in his first free poems, in which he emulated the French in lightness, frivolity and in pleasing, but by no means quite artificial versification and rhyme. His songs unexpectedly disturbed the seraphic

slumber. The melancholy whimpering and tender cooing of the saintly minstrels reconciled the Germans to the French, to whom the orthodox attributed cloven hoofs and horns, but whose lively and somewhat voluptuous manner Wieland faithfully transferred to German, and appropriated as his own. His 'Comic Tales'* appeared about 1765, to which, together with 'Oberon,' 'Musarion,' and the 'Graces,' a preference is still given above all his other poetical works. At that time the Germans had absolutely nothing animating and light of this kind, which without effect might be read to promote cheerfulness and afford entertainment; it was therefore quite indifferent from whence that was derived, which they read in agreeable verses in the writings of Wieland; he became the favourite of the nation. When these 'Comic Tales' are a little more closely examined, there will be found some considerable deformities, such as appear in every human work which does not spring from a higher inspiration, which it falls to the lot of very few to receive. We perceive that he has in his eye sometimes the wanton thoughts of La Fontaine, sometimes those of Crebillon, and sometimes even those of the dull Marmontel; that his wit is not always fine, his language far from pure, and sometimes even mean; but the easy verse and rhyme, the humour which never forsakes him, his worldly prudence and philosophy compensate for many vulgarities and for many a bad Biberach pun. What a pity, that in the midst of his jocular satires, which rest on admirable principles as their foundation, there should occur so many passages, altogether dull and cold, among so many vigorous and lively pictures!

The 'Musarion' is conceived and written in a somewhat more dignified and nobler tone than the comic tales; the language is somewhat purer; and the refined sensuality called Platonic love, which, as is well known, Wieland had renounced since he had given up Platonism and the religious visionary school, plays no such important and equivocal character as in his other light or romantic poetry. The philosophy of the men of the world, which is the staple of the poem, is not that of the highly endowed rake who is only at home in great cities; but that theory of prudence which may be justly called the beginning of wisdom, and which is here described and recommended with peculiar grace and loveliness.

* First Ed: 'Judgement of Paris,' 'Diana and Endymion,' 'Juno and Ganymede,' 'Aurora and Cephalus;' in 1784 'Juno and Ganymede' was omitted and 'Aspasia and Combabus' added.

Wieland paints a state of happiness which he really sought and longed for, which occupies a middle position between mere sensual enjoyments and the excessive transports of fanaticism, or the mystical holiness of the pious, which is hostile to all the best feelings and to the higher enjoyments of the inward and the outward life. Our readers must examine and read this philosophy for themselves in the 'Musarion'; we shall merely introduce a short passage from the Introduction, in the notes, in order to show how admirable and delightful a life is, according to his description, which is regulated by his rules*.

It was moreover a melancholy thing, that Wieland, a German poet, provoked by the relations of German life, by the silliness and sentimentality of the great multitude of poetasters, should have thought himself obliged to persecute with bitter irony that poetic life, or in other words that Utopian happiness, which intoxicates the poet, because it is the mere creation of his own imagination. The effort to be practical also in poetry, in order to please and meet the wishes of courtiers who wished to be German, without being more serious than before, according to the fashion of the times, embittered the minds of the new generation of our poets against Wieland. These young men were filled with the noble fire of youth and patriotism, but sometimes indeed indulged in a little of the riotous and carousing spirit of the Burschenschaft. They accused him not only of sensuality and wantonness, but they charged him, as an especial reproach, with wishing again to introduce the dry realities of the French school among the Germans, who had begun again to feel some of the influences of true inspiration.

We must indeed admit, with respect to 'Idris' and 'Zenide' and the 'New Amadis,' that they were only calculated for a public

* Mit jedem neuen Tag fühlt sich das Paar beglückter,
Indem sich jedes selbst im andern glücklich macht.
Durch überstandne Noth geschickter
Zum weiseren Gebrauch, zum reizendern Genuss
Des Glückes, das sich ihm so unverhofft versöhnte
Gleich fern von Dürftigkeit und stolzem Ueberfluss.
Glückselig weil er's war, nicht weil die Welt es wäunte,
Bringt Famias in neidenswerther Ruh'
Ein unbeneidet Leben zu.
In Freuden, die der unverfälschte Stempel
Der Unschuld und Natur, zu ächten Freuden prägt,
Gesundes Blut, ein unbewölkt Gehirn,
Ein ruhig Herz und eine heitre Stirne.

In the following verses comes the development of his principles of philosophy to which we have referred.

which was accustomed to similar trifling light French wares. They contain a mere play with the romantic, and in too many passages violate the principles of genuine art and of pure taste. There is no better or clearer proof of the progress of our language than may be had from a comparison of the contemporaneous prose of Lessing and Herder with that of Wieland; it will be immediately seen in what relation the vigorous strength and the close logic of Lessing stood to the light and loose sweetness of Wieland. In this respect 'The Graces' is particularly remarkable, because in it rhythmical prose and easy verse alternate, and border so closely on each other, that we glide almost insensibly from prose to verse. It by no means robs Wieland of his reputation that he had French models in his eye, particularly the well-known travels of Bachaumont and Lachapelle, inasmuch as he still remains peculiar and distinctive enough in himself. He proved to foreigners that our language also is fitted for this easy play of words.

It had been remarked of our language up to the middle of the century, that it belonged to a people whose life and all whose political being was governed by jurists and pedants, or by the corporal's cane; as early however as 1767, the language and literary education had completely changed. This may be seen from a little book composed by a man who was neither educated in a university nor a writer by profession, like Wieland. We refer to the idyllic tale of 'Wilhelmine,' in which Von Thümmel proved to the Germans that a poetic view might be given of prosaic life, and that they could very well afford to do without the dull shepherd world of Gessner. This poem, written in prose, conceived in a spirit of fine irony and tender pleasantry, still maintains a place by universal acknowledgment beside Göthe's 'Herrmann' and Dorothea and Voss's 'Louise.' We must not venture to go so far beyond the historical field, within whose limits we wish to confine ourselves, as to enter upon any characteristic notice or æsthetic examination of 'Wilhelmine.' We shall therefore only refer to one or two points in passing, which appear to us important in reference to the social circumstances which are therein indicated.

A. M. von Thümmel appears to have described the social condition of the times of the seven years' war, the times of the splendour of the nobles and courtiers, of the crouching of parsons and placemen, and of the patient endurance of peasants, with as

much truth and correctness, as Voss and Göthe that of the revolutionary period, in which the people for once felt their power for a short season, and luxury was extinguished. In the descriptions of Von Thümmel we see, as clearly as if we were present at a small court, the clergy embarrassed in deep submission, the noble lords so condescending with a consciousness of their superiority from birth and from the opinion of the world. What splendour of the nobles! how great the honour of their visit! how magnificent the equipages! how fawningly humble the middle classes! how overwhelmed with astonishment the degraded peasants at the splendid trains of their overbearing lords! what a difference between the butchers, cooks and feastings of the nobles, and the parsonage and its arrangements! how strongly do we feel our difference, and forget who properly, in the end, furnishes the money for it all! The irony which pervades the whole represents only the condition of the middle and lower classes in shade. The court and what belongs thereto appear in the distance, like a godlike glory. The poor parson, around whom all turns, is beset with a temptation to salute the court marshal's dressing-gown, a temptation which however at present does not beset the poorest German sinner. And the position of Wilhelmine to the court marshal, with respect to the manner in which parsons at that time obtained appointments and wives, is in the highest degree equivocal.

That the view of this poem, according to which the poet wished to make himself the laureate of the court mob, of the existing subordination of ranks and of splendour, is not a mere hasty thought, but deducible from the book itself, may be seen from the sharp cuts which Von Moser's 'Master and Servant' contains, and from the splendour with which noble amours are made to outshine plebeian marriages. And although it does not at all belong to our design, we cannot overlook the fact, nor omit its mention, that in all the writings of Von Thümmel, moral views are made peculiarly conspicuous, and that the conclusion in every respect is admirable.

'Wilhelmine' demands from us particular mention, because it is genuine German—because it describes in admirable language German customs and relations alone, and is altogether the product of German life. The poem maintains a place in our classic literature, and will survive the romantic. It was so widely circulated immediately on its appearance, that Nicolai thought he

could best recommend and bring his 'Sebaldus Nothanker' into circulation, by making it a continuation of 'Wilhelmine.' This was indeed a most unlucky thought, for a man in other respects so practical and intelligent.

§ III.

LAVATER—BASEDOW.

The contest about the connexion of the new and of the old principle—between the conservators of ancient abuses, who expected all light and knowledge from on high, and proposed all happiness to the obedient only on the other side the grave, and the friends of enlightenment and freedom, whose principle was reliance only upon the human understanding and the attainment by its means of a true estimation of life, and an ideal happiness upon earth—had been already awakened in the preceding period, became in the present more lively and earnest, and continues till the present day; we shall prove from Lavater and Basedow's influence in this period, that both of the then opposing parties had numerous supporters and followers, as they have now. It is besides remarkable, that even the party, as the representative of whom we shall quote Lavater, and whose leader he continued to be till the end of the century, was neither particularly favourable to the old scholastic dogmatics, the old school discipline, nor the old instruction.

Lavater and the party of whom he continued, his whole life through, to be the prophet and apostle, were indeed fanatics; but they opposed in no way the efforts and free movement which soon became universal, they laboured rather to clothe their faith in supernatural events and communications, and the visionary traditions of the Fathers in a new dress, or they announced at least antiquated ideas and fancies in a new language and in the modern manner of the new classic writers. The influence which this party gained was less disadvantageous in consequence of Lavater and many of his friends having declared themselves favourable to the theories of Rousseau, when these theories, in a somewhat altered form, were disseminated in Germany, and the principles of the whole social condition, *i. e.* of instruction and the education of youth, were changed. With

a view to our historical object, the awakening life of the Germans, we must not here omit calling the attention of our readers to the lively interest which was taken in all the writings of the heads of parties. Our astonishment is excited at the intellectual life which was exhibited as early as the seventh decennium in Germany, when all had been benumbed and dead so late as the fourth. The most various contradictions mingle with each other in our life and literature, and it was no uncommon thing to perceive in the same writer the most opposite colouring and tones at the same time; traces, for example, of Lessing's earnestness, of Nicolai's strength, of Herder's orientalism, and Lavater's redundancy. Lavater raved in favour of the supernatural, and Basedow preached the doctrine, that we must only seek after what is useful and palpable in life; both advanced and urged their views with the fiery zeal of fanaticism.

The different elements separated at a later period from one another, each class of readers again adopted its own writers, none was willing to learn or hear anything from any other source, and, as is well known, is become worse than ever the case in our days. Any work which was favourably received by one portion of the public, was scarcely looked at by the other. The circumstances moreover at present are just the reverse of those at that time. What was then well received by the people, is now sought after by the higher and highest ranks, and the reverse. Lavater (born 1741), whom we have selected as the representative and mouth-piece of the mystical party throughout the whole of the last decennia of the eighteenth century, was, on the one hand, pious and credulous; like Bodmer and his friends, an enthusiastic admirer of Klopstock, and firmly persuaded that miracles constituted the essential nature of Christianity, and yet, on the other hand, he was a disciple and apostle of Rousseau's doctrines of freedom, a sincere friend of democratical principles, and of the ideas of a simple life and education, founded on the natural rights which these principles inculcated.

Lavater's honest but vehement attack upon one of the great men of the then Zürich aristocracy, made it advisable for him to go for a time to Berlin, where, through Sulzer, he became acquainted with Spalding, Mendelssohn, and with the whole intellectual life of Northern Germany, and gained friends and reputation by his acquirements, talents, knowledge and character. This reputation was greatly increased by the publication of his

‘ Swiss Songs,’ (1767), which were set to music, and much sung, and by his ‘ Views into Eternity ’ (1768). His ‘ Swiss Songs ’ will probably survive when all the rest of Lavater’s writings are entirely forgotten. The favourable reception of the ‘ Views into Eternity,’ and of the bombast of the Klopstock fanaticism in poetic prose, founded Lavater’s reputation as a writer of the new epoch of our literature, and at the same time as the prophet and apostle of an altogether peculiar, sentimental and redundant faith.

About this time he came forward as the especial apostle of the fanatical system in opposition to the Berlin school, or rather in opposition to the mildest and ablest advocate of a natural religion founded upon a belief in God and immortality, against Moses Mendelssohn. Mendelssohn had reached the summit of his renown, and was esteemed by all parties as a profound thinker, although he was sometimes hostilely attacked, and attempted to be made contemptible as a Jew. Lavater challenged him either to refute his and Bonnet’s chimerical notions, or to become a Christian. The controversy which immediately took place upon this demand, excited the greatest attention, at a time when the whole educated public took a lively feeling of interest in every thing published by a man who was then regarded as one of the great reformers of literature.

Mendelssohn had gained for himself a great and well-merited reputation, first by his treatise, intitled, ‘ Pope a Metaphysician,’ which was written in conjunction with Lessing, then by his reviews in the ‘ Universal Library of the Fine Arts,’ and his participation in the ‘ Letters upon Literature,’ because he had rescued philosophy from the exclusive possession of the schools, introduced it into life, and expounded it in a dignified, but, at the same time, intelligible language. Mendelssohn was as modest as he was unweariedly industrious. He subjected his ‘ Letters upon the Feelings,’ to which he owed a large share of his renown, to a thorough revision, and published them in an amended and new edition in 1761, in the first part of his philosophical treatises. At the same time with these long-acknowledged essays upon taste, he published others in his philosophical treatises, by which he proved that he knew how to make the obscure and difficult speculations of metaphysicians intelligible to all educated men; our language gained immensely by these publications.

These essays, four in number, are appended to the first part of his philosophical writings. They consist of short, but uncommonly instructive, dialogues upon the principles of speculative philosophy. In the first three Spinoza and Leibnitz are compared in reference to their theory upon the connexion of body and soul, and Leibnitz's doctrine of what he calls the "eternity of the world," is examined. In the fourth he proves in a very easy way, that the reigning French philosophers, and most especially their head, Voltaire, never once surmised what serious thinking and deep speculation properly are. The treatises in the second part of these writings are of an æsthetic character, and have eminently contributed to replace, by another and better, 'The Theory of the Beautiful,' which had been disseminated in the preceding period by Gottsched, Bodmer, and Breitingen, and by the Frenchmen who were the models followed by Ramler and Sulzer.

We cannot follow Mendelssohn's labours on behalf of German philosophy and literature into particulars, in which case we must have dwelt at length upon his 'Prize-essay upon Evidence' and his participation in the works of Nicolai and Lessing. All this has no connexion with the controversy between Lavater as the defender of the necessity of the Christian revelation, and Mendelssohn as a teacher of natural religion, and this controversy alone stands in close connexion with Mendelssohn's chief work. The work referred to is his 'Phædon, or Essay upon the Immortality of the Soul.' This treatise first appeared in 1766, and was universally circulated and read. This essay was very strongly opposed to the orthodox who bounced and swaggered about a miraculous revelation being wholly indispensable to a belief in immortality, because it might be regarded as Mendelssohn's own confession of faith, and contained a defence of natural religion in a mild and attractive tone, in noble and pure language, without any polemical sallies or anything in the least respect hostile to Christianity. This essay, which secured for Mendelssohn a place among the most distinguished German classical writers and was frequently reprinted, was a great stumbling-block to orthodox believers: how did Lavater rejoice when he thought he had found in Bonnet an entirely new defender of his unenlightened faith! He raised a shout of triumph, as if a new prophet had appeared in the world.

Bonnet (a Genevese) was an accurate observer, and very ad-

vantageously known as a man well acquainted with natural history. He gained great celebrity by his 'Insectology,' his treatise upon 'The Use of Leaves in Trees and Plants,' and his 'Contemplation of Nature.' At that time every one regarded his view as entirely philosophical, viz. his reference of the whole of organic and inorganic nature, its phenomena and its connexion, according to the known edifying manner of physico-theology, to man and to the accidental advantages and use which he can derive from or make of it. The method followed by Bonnet in his 'Contemplation,' which is in fact founded upon Leibnitz's 'System of the Best World,' contains, as is well known, a wondrous union of the accidental and necessary, the great, the small and the pitiful; the natural history in the work is admirable, and Bonnet's manner of considering nature was highly instructive and edifying to the followers of his system; as long therefore as he only instructed people who had been educated and brought up like himself, all was admirable; but he went a step further. When his blindness unhappily deprived him of the power of being an observer of nature, by which he was eminently distinguished, and he was driven back wholly upon the resources of his mind, he devoted himself to theological speculations, and wrote his so-called 'Palingénésie Philosophique.'

In his 'Palingénésie,' Bonnet's object is to derive by philosophic abstraction the whole Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, nay, the whole Christian revelation, from the observation of nature, and Lavater not merely announced with triumph, that now the strictest proof had been perfectly and most satisfactorily furnished of what he regarded as Christian faith; but he published (1769) a German translation of the 'Palingénésie.' In fact nothing could be more suitable to Lavater's dreams of angels and devils, of ghosts and appearances, and of a spiritual world, which, however, on the other hand, was downrightly sensible, than this proof furnished by Bonnet of the immortality of human bodies; the work also was altogether fit for a certain class of men, whose apostle Lavater continued to be for his whole life, and which still appears to be very numerous at present in Germany, particularly in Bavaria and Suabia; but he had made a great mistake to require of such a man as Mendelssohn that he should regard his conceits as philosophy.

Lavater accompanied the book with remarks after his man-

ner*. An opinion may be formed of the nature of these remarks from the fact of his holding fast by the expression soul, and wishing at the same time to demonstrate that it is by no means impossible that souls should see one another in another life without bodies, forgetting altogether that his own notion soul is wholly incompatible with the notion of seeing. He himself, enthusiastic and honest as he was with all his vanity, had such a confident persuasion that all the Christian miracles were so indisputably proved in this work, that all doubts were put aside and difficulties surmounted, that in his preface he calls publicly and solemnly upon his friend Moses Mendelssohn, if he was an honest man, either to refute the 'Palingénésie' or to become a Christian.

Mendelssohn, modest and timid as he was, could not remain silent upon this demand, and he answered the challenge with caution and modesty, in a printed letter, pointed out how absurd, presumptuous and unreasonable such a challenge or demand was, which was directed by a member of the ruling Christian church to a scarcely tolerated Jew, he showed however, even in this letter, that the case was precisely the same with Bonnet's theory as it is, in our opinion, with the theological dialectics of our days. Mendelssohn alleges, namely, that he has no doubt he could in the very same way dialectically prove the truth of any religion whatsoever.

The public opinion at that time was so favourable to enlightenment, that the voices of by far the most important men in the country were loudly declared in favour of Mendelssohn. Lavater's friends even felt that he had brought faith into a bad plight and seriously injured his reputation, and his own peaceful and friendly feelings reminded him that he had been intolerant; he therefore printed a long letter, in which he withdrew his challenge. Mendelssohn afterwards availed himself admirably of this concession as an argument for the use of reason in matters of faith, and at the same time recommended believers to use their kind of dialectics only in the pulpit or in the professor's chair. Mendelssohn caused his first answer and Lavater's letter to be printed in 1750, with additions and with an appendix, in which he treats the proposition only indicated in his first answer at

* We call the reader's attention to the fact, that the same fables, the same philosophy, the same controversies now again appear after the course of twenty years. Men are always the same; but the new Lavaters are much worse than the old.

greater length, namely, that it would be easy according to Bonnet's system to demonstrate the truth and the divine origin of Islamism, or the doctrines of Buddha and Brahma.

From this time forward, as is well known, theologians sought more and more to reconcile their principles to those of a sound rational understanding; and the mystics, fanatics and friends of literal interpretation clung the more closely together, and soon acknowledged Lavater as their patriarch. He was afterwards recognized as a new prophet, from the extreme southern limits of Switzerland to Copenhagen and Riga. Two years afterwards (when his work on physiognomy had appeared), he was regarded in the whole of Europe as the supporter of orthodoxy and fanaticism. We shall be obliged to return to this original man, so much the more frequently in our subsequent chapters, as the people and masses of ordinary men who are too indolent to think, were dissatisfied with the cold morality which was preached to them instead of a warm and generous religion, and were ever ready to throw themselves into the arms of miracle-workers, religious impostors and fanatics; and Lavater, full of credulity, always was in advance of those who were deceived. We find him filled with astonishment at Gassner's miracles; he sought to combine Mesmer's magnetism with the theory of the Rosicrucians and with the nonsense of St. Martin; in common with Jung Stilling he traced the immediate operation of God in every insignificant event, and like him countenanced the stories and noises of ghosts, and the singing of hymns by spiritual beings.

The part which Lavater undertook, the reputation which he possessed among all parties, make him a person of great importance in the history of the lively spiritual movement of the following periods, which could never have taken place without a struggle of parties. We shall hereafter, therefore, take occasion to treat at length of his activity and of his short-lived new science of physiognomy; at present we must mention only one book more which is important in reference to the sentimentality and pensiveness which for a long time had entered into and formed a striking element in the burgher life of the Germans. Lavater's book is connected with the circumstances of society and of literature, which we shall afterwards notice when we come to speak of Werther and Siegwart. He had already gained such a high reputation as a young man, or imagined that he had gained it, that he thought he might claim from the public a reading of

his religious confessions in the 'Secret Journal of an Observer of himself,' which was afterwards published in Leipzig in two parts (1772, 1773).

In this journal we are not for a moment to think of confessions resembling those of Rousseau; the life of a Zürich clergyman afforded no materials for such a work; and Lavater himself acknowledges that he does not merely relate facts, but that he has mixed up invention with them. The book contains nothing else than the history of a few weeks of a very common burgher life, and it may be asked with justice, what the most zealous partisan of Lavater can find in this book. We answer: Lavater teaches an artificial system of devotion, and gives practical instruction with respect to the manner in which the feelings may be roused by external means, and how a vehement irresistible longing after an unattainable height of spiritual ecstatic fervour may be awakened in the mind: this gave the book an incomparable value in the estimation of certain classes of readers. The profane will see with a smile and a feeling of pity, how well-disposed vanity and spiritual presumption, combined with spiritual inspiration, humility and feeling, are therein delineated, and how striking and sharp the contrast often is.

This book contains the whole essence of Lavater's later fanaticism, his belief in the immediate and miraculous operation of prayer, the singular means which he employed, precisely as medicine is used, to raise himself to the proposed condition of excitement. All this is not only described but also presented to the eye by means of engravings and vignettes. The crucifix and the skull before which he prays appear several times and in a different manner; twice he is represented as contemplating a coffin—once an open one—and again that of his mother in the instant in which it is being closed. What is the most remarkable of all is, that all these things are recommended by a young man of thirty-three years old as exercises of piety for awakening deep religious feelings*. Lavater minutely describes his posi-

* We shall give a short passage, as a proof of his extraordinary manner, selected from his Reflections on his Thirty-third Birth-day, 'Secret Journal,' part i. p. 223.—"Two and thirty years are now flown, which should have been devoted to thee, my Creator, Father, Saviour—that is, to my own true and eternal happiness and to that of my fellow-creatures; and, after all, I must admit, whether I will or not, whatever others may think or judge of me, if I speak the truth, I must with shame admit that I am still in reality the same godless, lost man, of which I felt a lively sense in the beginning of my rational life, whose view filled with such deep shame every one of my for-

tions in prayer; the number and mode of his genuflections; and intentionally recalls the manner in which he sighed, and was filled with anxious feelings on the most affecting occasions, as for example by the death-bed of a friend; and yet again in the midst of the deepest mysticism, on the very borders of the monkish and cloister world, he gives way to free thoughts and reflections, even upon religious things.

At a time in which all noble minds, whatever opinions they entertained, were agreed that the iron fetters must be burst which for centuries had been fastened upon the souls and bodies of the Germans, Lavater also in his way and from his own side, struggled as seriously and vigorously against the domineering consistories and theological catechisms, as Spalding and Semler on their side, or Lessing and Nicolai on theirs†. In the whole of this singular and vain book, there is not the slightest trace to be found of hypocrisy; and it is impossible in the ‘*Journal*,’ or in any of his writings, not to perceive the seriousness of Lavater’s religious feelings, the truthfulness and zeal of his efforts; but we are also astonished, how a man who had such singular opinions of life and of religion as he had, could have gained and maintained such an important position among the most distinguished men of the present and the following period as Lavater maintained, and that in the best times of our literature, in the noble striving of all minds after sentiments and modes of thinking, such as antiquity honoured.

There will be found mixed up together in his journal the

mer birth-days, drew from me so many burning tears, so many deep, and as I believed, honest sighs, which I have already so often and so much lamented and abhorred.”

† We shall here again select another and somewhat longer passage from the second part; and if the question here was about the instruction of the people alone, we should without qualification agree with Lavater. ‘*Secret Journal*,’ part ii. pp. 132, 133. “We were speaking however of the instruction of children in religion,—to them all should be shortly and feelingly described,—every thing with respect to God and Christ should be related and represented without all compulsion, in a natural and a most cheerful mien. The Saviour should be represented on the streets and highways surrounded by the needy and miserable, whom he relieves; sometimes in gentle confidential intercourse with his disciples; sometimes in condescending (?) converse with a woman in humble life; sometimes at a meal; sometimes delighting himself with children: few doctrines propounded, much history, calculated to awaken moral feelings and to blend with their own. Good God! how many more would in this way be held upright than by eternal dry dogmatics! We both agree in an almost intolerant dislike to catechisms, in which the most essential, the moral pleasures of a history realized to the senses, are utterly wanting.”

narrowest and the freest opinions, Protestant and Catholic ideas developed, and yet Lavater was the very man, because, by reason of his unlimited influence upon female and feminine minds, he ruled like a saint—Lavater was the man who prepared the way and gave importance and value to Basedow's revolutionary and freethinking notions on education and instruction. He was one of the very first who declared himself favourable to the wonderful plan of the so-called philanthropical institutions. Basedow, from his own education, from his domestic and social training, from the instruction which he had himself enjoyed and the intercourse which he had had, from his love of intoxicating drinks which clung to him from his youth, appeared as little fitted for a reformer of the education of the young, and of modes of instruction, and mental and moral improvement, as Rousseau was fitted to be a preacher of virtue; and yet he succeeded in effecting a complete change in the whole nature of education and instruction in Germany, which Rousseau was neither able to accomplish in his native country nor in France, however far he excelled Basedow both as a thinker and writer.

Basedow was half self-taught, half an ill-disciplined scholar of bad institutions of education, poor and ill-treated, early addicted to the bad habits of the lower classes in the large towns of North Germany, and occasionally given to drunkenness, a servant, student, tutor in the most humbling connexion; but nevertheless, as soon as he gave indications of talent, he was aided in a friendly manner by the protector and promoter of the efforts of the new time, in which there was a great want of useful teachers who understood and were able to meet the wants and the demands of the age. As early as 1753 he was appointed professor of moral philosophy and of the fine arts in the academy at Sorø, which was an institution for the education of the sons of the higher classes. While there, he wrote his 'Practical Morality for all Ranks,' and pointed out in this work the necessity of a complete reform in the whole system of education, in consequence of the advancement and progress of the age; the supporters of things as they are, the pillars of the church, are always deaf to such hints, they linger and wait till the storm rises and overwhelms all. The president of the institution scented out in this most innocent book some deviations from the Lutheran doctrinal formulas, but the rigidly orthodox Danish government was somewhat more considerate than he,—it removed Basedow in

1761 to Altona, and placed him in a situation where he had leisure to write books, to follow up his well-meant notions of reforming mankind by means of instruction and general education, and to think of plans for carrying out his designs.

At this time the public opinion was unfriendly to rigid orthodoxy, and to the dull and gloomy writings of scholastic learning; and Basedow, as a writer, obtained a great public by his bold tone, his original manner, and, at a later period, by his candour in all discussions about orthodoxy. He began his comprehensive plan of a reformation in learning with a proposal to improve the means and mode of instruction in the universities. He soon renounced this plan, partly because he was obviously not equal to the task, and partly because he would have had to do with people who stood far above him in respect and knowledge, who possessed considerable influence, and however hostile they might be among themselves, yet held firmly together when any question was raised by a third party about the reformation of abuses. Basedow however well understood the kind of tactics, which is much to be recommended to a certain class of writers in Germany, and which consists in continuing without weariness or fear again and again to appear before the public, and to force attention to their arguments and their claims.

In 1764 he first wrote his 'Philaethy,' which is a mixture of theology and philosophy*; he probably however observed that he had been too precipitate, and in the following year published his 'Theoretical System of Sound Reason, an Academical Compound,' which, as he himself says in the introduction, contains the chief contents of his 'Philaethy' abridged and improved. These were the books which were designed to promote that reform in the manner of treating philosophical subjects in the universities, of which we have spoken. A professor in Göttingen sought to effect this reform, two years afterwards, in a better way (1767). What Basedow wished to accomplish by his vehement and stormy manner, by his original and radical notions, accompanied by the bitterest sallies against all speculative writers, the mild, friendly, amiable and learned writer in Göttingen, who no less highly valued what was true in Rousseau's writings than Basedow did, sought to reach in a very different manner, and

* The full title of the book is :—'New Views into the Truths and Religion of Reason, as far as the limits of Credible Revelation, opened up to the Public.' by Joh. Bern. Basedow, Royal Danish Professor. Altona, 2 vols. 8vo.

was not unsuccessful in his design; Basedow therefore began to limit his views to schools and private education.

Before we pass on to speak of Basedow's writings, which, in an almost inconceivable manner, effected a complete reform in domestic life, in the connexions of parents, children and teachers, we must yet present a few remarks on the blindness of the orthodox, and their obstinate resistance to the spirit of the age. They made every man a martyr, who only quietly uttered what every man secretly felt; they thus gained for him partisans and a party, and instead of a reformation by this mode of action, they brought about a revolution. Basedow's example is a full proof of the position. He was proclaimed as a heretic by the orthodox, persecuted and denounced, and yet he came afterwards to be praised and commended by princes and states, by all the enlightened in Germany, by pious Denmark, by the Empress of Russia, and regarded in the whole of Europe as an eminent benefactor of mankind. One extreme always begets another, and homœopathic means have often proved their influence in moral as well as in physical diseases: what especially relates to Basedow may be seen from what follows.

From the years 1763—1770, Basedow deluged Germany with a number of works upon religion and religious instruction, which in this place we neither will nor can fully enumerate; we shall only mention three or four, because they had the greatest effect, and caused a complete separation between him and the watchmen of the Lutheran Zion in Hamburg and Lubeck, Götze and Winkler, and their religious followers, the citizens and magistrates of those states. He had already enraged the strictly orthodox almost to madness by his 'Methodical Instruction in a rational and satisfying Knowledge of Biblical Religion,' published in 1764, and the same Götze, who had before taken the field against Spalding and Semler, who had at a later period stirred up and incensed the people and the magistrates against Lessing, against Göthe, against the 'Frankfort Notices,' again blew his trumpet of alarm, and thundered against him from his pulpit. In this way Basedow obtained opportunities for the publication of many writings against these watchmen of the church*. The rage of the clergy procured him many more readers than he would otherwise have had for his 'Organon, or

* 'Address to the People against Winkler;' then a defence of his writings against Götze; then a small volume of polemical treatises.

impartial Investigation of the Religion and Actions of the Heretics.' The same principles were brought forward with respect to natural religion in this work, which had been taught in his other writings in different words; but the zealots of the church in this case displayed the bitterest animosity, because he now began also to use and to explain the Bible in his own way.

He had besides been recommended to the people as a friend of enlightenment, and the more he was preached against, condemned and persecuted, the more active he became in writing. In the year 1765 he published, along with other writings, his 'Considerations upon true Orthodoxy, and the Necessity of Toleration in Church and State,' and immediately afterwards an 'Essay upon the Truth of the Christian Religion.' And the orthodox?—they abused and persecuted him; they entreated the city and state police by outward measures to supply what was deficient in the inward substance of their reasons. Basedow fell under a regular formal Lutheran excommunication; no one would venture wholly to break with the orthodox, by printing his writings, to which they had such a vehement antipathy, because he had roused and disturbed them from their slumber; and had not the noble Bernstorff extended him his protection, his case would have been almost hopeless. From what took place at that time in Hamburg and Lubeck, and afterwards in Frankfort, in monarchies and in republics, it was evident that hatred, calumny and persecution are always the true fruits of blind and superstitious faith.

The chief magistrate of Hamburg issued a formal warning against Basedow's writings, prohibited their being printed under heavy penalties, and forbade all the schoolmasters to use any of his methodical writings under pain of banishment from the territory. The clergy were extremely indignant, that the only truly learned man in Hamburg, Reimaruss, who was universally esteemed, as well as their colleague Alberti, with whom Voss, as is well known, cultivated a strict friendship, kept up an intercourse with people of such bad reputation as Lessing and Basedow, who wished to call the Germans from a state of torpor and death to a new life. They went so far as to refuse the Lord's Supper to Alberti, who, even in their opinion, was in other respects wholly irreproachable, but steadfastly refused to break off his connexion with Basedow. In Lubeck they went still further,

and prohibited any book written by Basedow from being brought into their territory under a penalty of fifty dollars.

This amazing alarm amongst the friends of darkness, and the favourers of the dominion of the police over mind as well as body, secured an entrance for Basedow's wonderful proposals for the general improvement; because it was thus made evident to the most unwilling, that nothing was to be expected from the authorities, from the ossified clergy, or from the stupified or cunning inmates of the schools and universities, which were institutions for mis-education. Basedow, under the influence of an unbounded enthusiasm, which to a cool observer must have appeared extraordinarily ridiculous, did however precisely that which the coolest and most calculating understanding would have suggested as the most prudent. He acted as if he were always mindful of the old proverb, that "a continual dropping wears the hardest stone." We shall follow him here only in his preparatory steps; because the erection and the history of the great institution in Dessau for the deliverance of mankind, falls altogether within the following period.

At the same time with his 'Philaethy,' Basedow had published as early as 1765, that 'Methodical Instruction in Religion and Morals,' which had so embittered the minds of the clergy against him. In this treatise he had already formally declared, that he intended to bring about a revolution by means of instruction given according to the plan developed in his 'Philaethy.' He declares, namely, that he wishes to show how religion might be taught after the manner of Rousseau, that is, how the understanding and mind might be awakened and enriched by religious instruction. Leaving positive religion altogether to the church, he seeks to gain this object in his little work, by propounding in the first chief division, a preliminary knowledge of mankind and of the world; and, in the second, natural religion. In 1767 he had already extended his plan. He had now conceived the notion of a general improvement of the whole system of schools and education, and was thinking of a work (an elementary book) which should serve as a foundation for the new method of instruction of the whole family of man. About Easter 1768, he issued his first printed manifesto to mankind, upon their near deliverance, by means of education and an elementary book.

We must regard this 'Address to the Friends of Humanity'

about this elementary book, as a manifesto; for subscriptions to the large and costly engravings, which were necessary for the carrying out of his plan, were not only earnestly recommended as the first and holiest duty of humanity, in a way in which people now-a-days can only recommend railroads and manufactories; but all governments were urgently solicited to promote the erection of an institution, in which, under Basedow's direction, his principles might be applied on a large scale, and future teachers of youth might be trained. The real condition of the time, to whose sometimes exaggerated enthusiasm for pure and true human culture and improvement we owe the whole of our new literature, and in which all the noblest minds of all ranks combined in order to carry out a great national object, can be more clearly shown by nothing than by the consequences of Basedow's wonderful manifesto. In order in some measure to explain this, we must remember that just at that time Rousseau's 'Emile' and his 'Heloise' were in all hands, and nobody wished to remain behind Julia and M. von Wollmar, or to have his children plagued about knowledge and learning, if it was so easy to become wise and to be wise, as Rousseau taught. The kind and manner of instruction which was then given in the schools, the education, the tormenting discipline, the primness of the children, even their clothing, the perruques and swords of ten years' old boys, the hoop-petticoats and other dress of the girls; all this was a most surprising contrast to the ideal which was formed in the heads of the educated.

The first result of the announcement of Basedow's miraculous spiritual cure, was questions and letters from all parts, from noble men and women of all ranks; we speak not merely of men who were at that time very numerous in Germany, the well-disposed and vain weather-cocks of fashion, but of able, practical and experienced men of the world, to whom Basedow became an oracle. He laboured therefore at first by private correspondence to promote private education. This private correspondence, or rather the counsel which in numerous cases he gave, and which had had a universal bearing, he had afterwards collected and published, or, to speak more correctly, soon after the commencement of such correspondence, he no longer gave written replies, but printed and published his answers in a journal. With this view he first wrote in 1768-1769, his 'Correspondence with the Friends of Mankind,' which

he afterwards intitled 'Quarterly Reports of an Elementary Work' (1770, 1771). These sheets were used to embody his plan of a revolution, to show its application in individual cases, and to make what was immediately useful, agreeable and easy in his theory and principles, obvious to all by explaining it in intelligible language.

From this instant the subscription to his grand work rapidly increased, and all Europe appeared to take an interest in Basedow's great undertaking. Princes, magistrates, free states, ministers of state, the most distinguished learned men in Germany and in Switzerland, the Academies of Berlin and Petersburg, approved and recommended his elementary work; and even Lavater rejoiced in the plan as one which was more advantageous than disadvantageous to religion.

The noble-minded and free-thinking Zürich prophet united his labours with those of Iselin of Basle, whose name at that time was held in high estimation, especially among that portion of the public who thought chiefly about what was palpable and advantageous, because it combined a sort of political economy with a true love of mankind, and was practical, like the people of Basle themselves. With a view to the promotion of Basedow's great plan, Iselin wrote a treatise, the first edition of which was very widely circulated in Germany, and which was twice reprinted in quick succession in North Germany. Basedow himself did not disdain even the character of a mountebank and sample-vender, in order to bring the subscription to a successful issue*, although in other respects his inspiration for his cause was altogether honest and far removed from the mean love of gain or of speculation; and his efforts were successful. Before the work itself appeared, Basedow published a specimen of his child's book, which gave the greatest satisfaction to the larger number of parents and readers, because no one knows who has not had great experience, that there is an important object in the very toil and labour of learning, and that knowledge gained or used in an easy way always remains weak and unsatisfactory.

* It is well known that Basedow's wife and the clergyman used all possible arguments and entreaties to induce him to give up the notion of having his daughter baptized. 'Prænumeraſtia Elementaria Philanthropia.' The reader will probably call to mind the passage in which Göthe so admirably describes Basedow, and his vulgar human enthusiasm, in contrast with the polite and philosophic indifference of good society—a certain class of men whom Göthe most admired and imitated.

According to the miraculous promises of Basedow, which he sent forth, all languages and subjects, grammar and history were to be learned as a mere amusement. Morality and religion, both Jewish and Christian, Catholic as well as Protestant, were to be easily impressed.

The little work which we designate as the forerunner of the elementary book, appeared in 1769, at the same time as the third piece of his 'Quarterly Correspondence,' and was published as a separate work, with three engravings, under the title, 'The Object, Possibility and Proof of the promised Elementary Book upon the Knowledge of Languages and Things, and at the same time the Commencement of the Work of an Elementary Book for the Improvement of School Education.' About Easter, in the following year, there appeared a part of the proper work itself, viz. 'A Methodical Book for Fathers and Mothers of Families, and for the People, and three portions of the Elementary Book for Youth, and for their Teachers and Friends, among the well-bred Classes,' adorned and illustrated with fifty-three beautiful engravings. At the same time, upon the recommendation of Büsch and Kästner, Basedow engaged Wolke (who, like himself, had not enjoyed the advantage of a learned school education) as his assistant in mathematics, the natural sciences and technology. Wolke was able to adapt his instruction to the minds of children better than Basedow; but he was very often, in consequence, silly and childish, and knew as little as Basedow and Schlözer, wherein real human training and education, and greatness of mind, consist. Wolke made an experiment, with the new method, upon Basedow's little daughter, and he afterwards exhibited her in a public examination, which was every where spoken about, as a mountebank pulls teeth upon a stage. The history of the effect produced by the appearance of the great work itself, of the institution in Dessau, of the book and institutions of Salzmann and Campe, of the reforms and the regulation of children and childish affairs in life and in literature, belongs to the following period; we must add only, in conclusion, that the success of one plan in the case of Basedow immediately called forth another, and a manifesto was published concerning this in 1770.

Basedow wished to unite an immense manufactory of books and an institute for the education of teachers, with a gigantic school for the good of mankind and the promotion of humanity, and announced this scheme by a 'Proposal and Account of the

approaching Improvement of School Education, by Means of the Elementary Book, School Cabinets, Treatises upon Education, and an Elementary Institution.' By this last Basedow meant to characterize that great philosophic school, which upon a very diminished scale was afterwards erected at Dessau, in which not only children, but also teachers, were to be trained for the application of the improved instruction for training under Basedow's direction.

§ IV.

LESSING.

We bring this period to a conclusion with a notice of the services rendered by Lessing from 1756-1771, and, in so doing, completely pass over his contributions to the 'Letters upon Literature,' because we have mentioned these in the beginning of this division, in which we brought forward his name, and which we must still continue to bring forward, as the man who, above all others, was the creator of a new language, and the most vehement opponent of slavish subjection to unreasonable customs. Moreover, he first reached the pinnacle of his glory in the following period, in his contest with a Lutheran clergyman, and with the Byzantine theory of the school systems; alas! he fell, about the same time, a sacrifice to his fiery zeal. Lessing had this great advantage over others who, after him, enriched the German language, German literature and German life, from the pure and genuine sources of the ancients, and particularly of the Greeks, that he wrote always simply, solidly and impressively, after their model, without ever doing violence to the language, without departing widely from the style of common intercourse, but showing how both the language and servile life of the Germans must be improved and ennobled. He is also great in never having gone beyond the reach and understanding of the people, in order to reign in self-created glory; and that he disdained all the miserable means of egotistical souls to procure for himself a name; that he neither made parties, cringed about courts, nor revelled in a little brief authority; that he was neither the organ of an academy or university, in order to get clients for himself and customers for his bookseller. We must dwell at greater length upon his services to our language and litera-

ture, upon his unsurpassed and unsurpassable master-pieces of eloquence and poetry, as he was neither, in the proper sense of the word, a popular writer, nor wished to be, because, in all his writings, he had the educated portion of society, and that alone, in his eye. Lessing alone, of all his contemporaries, understood the very difficult art of writing in a severely logical, solid, instructive, and at the same time entertaining and lively manner, and, by his manner of treating, compelling his readers to feel an interest in, the subject. Without condescending to petty allusions or witticisms, or exciting the fancy by descriptions of all kinds, he knew how to make treatises even upon learned subjects, or polemical writings upon difficult points, attractive to his readers by the manner of his exposition.

Lessing, besides, belonged to the small class of learned men who neither over-estimate nor falsely estimate themselves, when they have obtained a great reputation; he knew himself; he knew that he had, properly speaking, more judgement and taste than great poetic talents, and when he would illustrate his own rules by his own example and appear as a poet, he confined himself to those species of poetry which neither demanded dithyrambic inspiration nor tragical fire. ‘*Emilia Galotti*’ is no exception to this remark, because he wrote this piece only to show that a German tragedy was not quite an impossibility, although the excellence of the Greeks could not be attained.

At the end of the foregoing period, and through a part of that of which we are now speaking, whilst he spent some time in the house of Count Tauenzien, he was occupied with other pursuits than literature; however, he had quietly prepared two works, with which he commenced the second portion of his literary career, viz. ‘*Laocoon*,’ and ‘*Minna von Barnhelm*.’ ‘*Laocoon*, or on the Limits of Painting and Poetry,’ first appeared in 1766, and ‘*Minna von Barnhelm*’ in the following year. Quite a new theory of the beautiful, and one entirely different from that which had previously prevailed, began to spread in Germany on the appearance of this work, and of Herder’s ‘*Fragments*,’ which was contemporaneous with it, and this theory was different also from anything which could be learned from our western neighbours. By means of Winkelmann, Lessing, and Heyne, the study of antiquity about this time, in Germany, took quite a different direction, and gained a much higher importance than in all the rest of Europe, and people learned to shake off the

fetters of the handicraft learning of small towns and to feel what true education really was.

Lessing's 'Laocoon' was the result of his study of Winkelmann's writings, and the latter, shortly before his death, recognised Lessing's merits in reference to his judgement upon art and works of art, and admitted that Lessing had shown himself to be so far his superior in respect to exposition, style and language, that he wished he could have written in the same manner. Lessing did not merely wish to form a judgement about ancient works of art, or to explain the subjects of the ancient history of art, but he wished to show his fellow-countrymen that the poetic delineations and verse-making, which were then regarded among them as poetry, were not such, but only rhetoric. In the same manner as Winkelmann's views, which Lessing followed, laid the foundation, as is well known, in all Europe, of quite a different judgement of art from that which had previously prevailed, Lessing's 'Laocoon' altered the ruling theory of the schools in Germany with respect to the beautiful in works upon the art of poetry. In the 'Laocoon' the world was made familiar, in an agreeable and entertaining manner, with the models of the ancients, and people were taught how to avail themselves of those which were most distinguished among them, and thus placed in a situation to judge for themselves; and it became, consequently, more difficult than before to gain a poetical name and reputation.

Lessing, who judged very modestly of his own poetical capacities, did not hesitate to say, that his friend Kleist had formed a very different opinion of his 'Spring,' which was admired in all Germany, from that of the German public. He had himself seen that this series of poetical figures, ranged one after another according to his English model, was destitute of that motion which constitutes the soul of poetry; he therefore proposed to alter the whole, to project a plan to keep in his eye, and to introduce in suitable places and arrangement, the multitude of images which, in the exuberance of a youthful creative fancy, he had selected at random from the endless compass of reviving creation. The choice of 'Laocoon,' and the addition to the title, at once show how well Lessing understood the manner of hitting his aim; for we immediately think of the renowned sculpture, of the passage of the second book of the 'Æneid,' and he needed only to call to remembrance the 'Philoctetes' of Sophocles,

writhing in bodily agony, to unite every thing which he needed as a foundation for his theory. He shows by the work of the artist, of the rhetorical poet, and of the creative and inspired tragedian, in what manner every one who will be great in his kind must avail himself of his materials in a manner peculiar to the species which he has chosen.

It is no part of our duty here to give an æsthetical estimate of 'Minna von Barnhelm,' as we are not writing a history of the drama; we mention it only in reference to Lessing's immortal merits in awakening our nation to a national and burgher life, to self-esteem, and to a confidence in their own language. Diderot had acknowledged Lessing's 'Miss Sarah Sampson' as his best piece in his new species of play, lying between comedy and tragedy; Lessing, however, himself, saw that this play had none of the three elements, by means of which a drama could become national, and the stage be made attractive to the great mass of the people, viz. nationality, a definite colour, and, together with the general, a particular interest: all three were combined in 'Minna von Barnhelm.'

As regards nationality, the piece only contains German history, German customs and feelings. As to colouring, the seven years' war is regarded in all Germany as a heroic struggle under the leading of Frederick against foreign supremacy, as a struggle of freethinking against the favourers of darkness of every kind; and the whole turns upon this war. A Prussian officer, at that time, upon the stage made somewhat the same impression upon the German spectators that an officer of the old guard makes upon the French of our days. In this piece Lessing has admirably availed himself of the strong feelings of dislike entertained by our nation towards those shameless foreigners who were received and caressed at all courts and in all noble and fashionable societies, in order to give the piece an interest for the people, who among us are allowed to go away empty, and whose modes of thinking and feeling are rarely if ever in the least degree consulted. With respect to the particular interest which is combined with the general one, it arises from our sympathy and participation in the fate of the brave soldiers and officers who were dismissed at the conclusion of the war, and who sought for a place of shelter and retirement in all the nooks and corners of Germany. The Frenchman in the piece is only a caricature, but by means of this exaggeration the author wished to show

the people how shamefully their kindly dispositions, which in the piece are represented in the fairest side, their integrity, their honesty, were abused by the Parisian cheats who then abounded everywhere.

On the re-awakening of mental and national life among us, there was a hope that, in the midst of the tyranny of tribunals and pulpits, the stage at least might be made an institute for the mental improvement and training of the people, and for giving them a freer view of our narrow relations; and it gave, at first, promise of success; but this was not possible without the aid of the several governments, and these had good reasons for not promoting any such design. What however Lessing could not do for the nation itself through the stage, he effected at least by his criticisms for literature.

There was an ardent desire at that time to realize the great thought of a national theatre in the noblest sense of the word, in Hamburg, to form poets and actors, and to bring both as artists into high estimation with the nation. Ackermann's company in Hamburg was regarded as pre-eminent; Eckhof and some other members of the Hamburg theatre of that day are still esteemed among us as the most celebrated artists of their kind; and an effort was made to induce Lessing in 1767, who had at that moment no particular occupation, to settle in Hamburg as a writer for the theatre and a critic. He accepted the invitation, and in pursuance of this wish wrote his 'Hamburg Dramaturgy,' which from a mere theatrical newspaper has become a classical work, which had the greatest influence, not merely upon the taste, but also upon the life, customs and views of the middle classes—the kernel of our people, till the *esprits forts* sold fogs and clouds to the poor Germans for figures of heavenly light.

Lessing himself says in the announcement and introduction of the *Dramaturgy*,—"This paper, which is intended to appear twice a week, will give a critical account of all the pieces brought out, and accompany every step which the art of the poet as well as that of the actor shall take." After a year's trial it appeared that it was quite impossible to reach that perfection which had been contemplated, and at the same time, that Lessing was by far too good for an ordinary playwright, to prepare pieces for the mass of the people; his master-pieces of criticism, however, had been completed, and the educated German public regarded them as such. Lessing himself declares, at the conclusion,

what truly has been very rarely done by a man whose pieces have been acknowledged as master-works by his contemporaries, and regarding which his own age alone felt indignant, that he did not wish to make a trade of the production of works of art, as Kotzebue, Walter Scott, Bulwer and others have done, that he did not look upon himself as a poet, and least of all as a dramatical one. He adds, that he had indeed written pieces, and in his youth not a few; but that only because there were no tolerable German pieces in existence. He was no German Goldoni, and could not write pieces by dozens for the German stage, as the latter had done for the Italian; on the other hand, that criticism was his proper department, and that he had fully attained his object in respect to the German stage by means of his 'Dramaturgy.'

We shall subjoin the passage in which, calling Aristotle to recollection, he declares that his sheets are by no means to be confounded with the common daily press, that his views are serious, and that what he propounds is scientific. We select this passage intentionally, in order to show how he could be witty without witticism, lively without allusions, and excel in beautiful description without images and flowers*. He declares that he had attained the object which he had proposed to himself, and only fully indicates at the conclusion this object, which he had been very careful not to announce in the commencement. He wished to drive out all the remains of the dulness of the Gottsched school, to lessen the admiration of the French, which by means of the courts and higher circles had become almost universal, without precisely announcing this intention.

In this design he most fully succeeded, and the means which he employed for its attainment, whether intentional or accidental, were

* Lessing's Works, Part 25, p. 344.—"It occurred to them to make me useful in that very way which made me a tedious, or as it appears to my more expeditious friends, an idle workman in criticism. And this originated the idea of the present papers. The notion pleased me. It called to mind the *Didaskalia* of the Greeks; the short notices, such as even Aristotle thought it worth his while to write, upon the pieces of the Greek theatre. It reminded me that a long time ago I had secretly laughed at the deeply learned *Casaubon*; because, judging from his own high estimation for all that is solid in knowledge, he imagined that Aristotle in his '*Didaskalia*' had been chiefly interested about the correction of the chronology. Truly it would have been an eternal disgrace to Aristotle if he had concerned himself more about the poetic value of the pieces—their influence upon manners, about the formation of taste, than about the year of the Olympiad, and the name of the Archon, in whose time it was produced! I had at first a mind to name the paper '*Hamburg Didaskalia*.' But the title sounded too strange, and now I am well pleased that I have preferred this," &c.

admirably calculated for the purpose ; and Lessing was the only man who could at the same time have accomplished such an object in a scientific way, and have made the result of his criticism obvious to the whole people. Lessing was well acquainted with the Spanish, French, Italian and English dramatic literature, and knew that of antiquity in a way which no other man in the eighteenth century did ; he was intimately acquainted with the theories of the French and of all the moderns, as well as with that of Aristotle, and takes refuge under the shadow of the latter in order to protect himself by his reputation. As to the course in which either instinct or tact led him, which mark the master in every department, or which inspiration prompted, he proceeds slowly from the most particular to the general, and not only points out what is deficient but also universally indicates where something better is to be found.

The ‘*Dramaturgy*’ commences with the tragedy of ‘*Olinthus and Sophronia*,’ which Von Cronegk, who was then dead, had borrowed from Tasso. This author also at that time had gained great celebrity by his ‘*Codrus*,’ which was honoured with the prize in Leipzig ; but what else can be said of these pieces written in rhyming Alexandrines, than that it is very melancholy to think that such pieces could have been ever tolerable in Germany ? Lessing also expresses this opinion, but with greater caution and delicacy, and from the drama he turns his attention to the artists who appeared in it, and commends them for having here and there brought far more out of a piece than was really contained in it.

Immediately after he had shown what the condition of the German tragedy was, he proceeds to show that Germany had nothing to hope from the new French comedy, and this may be made very obvious from what he says of *La Chaussée*, a piece translated from the French, of the representation of which he was then speaking. He goes on this occasion to the very root of the matter, and in a few but vigorous words, he teaches what in his time very few persons understood, but which ten years afterwards was clear to all educated people. We refer to the passage in which he indicates that modern times were altogether destitute of those elements which were fit materials for tragedy, or which could enliven a comedy not merely with conventional but with free and manly pleasantry. He says,—“ There is no real tragic element in the life of the French and in their whole poetry ;

however pompous and lofty a tone it may assume, we must be joyful when we can find among them anything, which at least may satisfy the mind." An article upon Rousseau's '*Héloïse*,' which at that time attracted so much notice in Germany that a Mr. Heufeld brought it upon the stage in the form of a tragedy, has the same reference to the prevailing admiration of all that was fashionable in Paris. He avails himself of the opportunity furnished by the representation of this piece, to speak of the novel itself in a similar strain as Mendelssohn had already done in the '*Letters upon Literature*.'

All this forms an admirable introduction to a criticism upon the productions, upon the whole manner of composition and mode of thinking of Voltaire, who was then regarded as incomparable and was the idol of the whole fashionable world. Lessing does not concern himself with Voltaire as a writer, but merely as a dramatic poet; the original criticism only affects the taste of the public which at that time in literary and poetical things inveighed against any other judgement than its own, any other taste than that of the common people. Lessing has especially shown his art and his strength in these numbers which have reference to Voltaire, and his voice pervaded the nation, and produced effects which were not only surprising, but in literary matters altogether unheard of. A number of the best geniuses, and among them Göthe and Klinger, the greatest men of the eighteenth century, sought immediately, in the following years, in Shakespeare for that art of poetry and for those dramatic qualities which Lessing had altogether denied to the rhetorician Voltaire. He says, with a sneering allusion to Voltaire's admirers,—“After he had published his '*Zaïre* and *Alzire*' they were strengthened in the opinion that the French tragic poets had already far surpassed the Greeks.”

Voltaire himself, by his unlucky thought of imitating the ghost scene in Hamlet in his '*Semiramis*,' had given the German critic, who knew how to avail himself in a masterly way of every unguarded position of an adversary, the best opportunity of comparing the art of Shakespeare, which sprung from true inspiration, with the artificiality of the eulogized poet of high life. After he had first in this way demolished the chief supporters of the French manner, he endeavours to prove by single examples and by obvious proofs drawn from the very pieces which had been represented, that the whole theory of comedy as well

as of tragedy, which had been hitherto regarded as well-founded, was neither in unison with the Grecian models, nor with the doctrine of Aristotle, of which the French were accustomed to boast. He sets authority against authority—his explanation and interpretation of Aristotle in opposition to that of the French.

He could indeed very easily prove that there was no dramatic poetry in Germany, which he did in a very gentle and sparing manner. He began with Cronegk, and came afterwards to Schlegel; in speaking of Gellert's productions, he shows with much cleverness, that the every-day scenes and every-day men of common Leipzig life could neither produce any effect in representation, nor even be properly called poetry.

In the last Numbers (Nos. 33-55) of the first part of his 'Dramaturgy,' he proceeds to the development of a new and German theory of the drama, in which example and theory, the universal and the particular, the authority and judgment of models everywhere acknowledged as admirable, are combined. He treats of the characteristics of comedy and tragedy, of unity of action, the *dramatis personæ*, and of the nature of the drama in general, and with great acuteness of perception compares the poetry of Corneille and Voltaire with that of Homer and Euripides, and thus shows the German public in what respects the old Grecian life and the poetry of the Greeks differed from those of the moderns.

The last essays of the first part formed an excellent preparation for what was said in the first articles of the second part concerning the French style, that is, their pompous verses and monotony, which were fitted only to their unnatural tragic declamation. He contrasts the English and Spanish with the French, and was the man who first directed attention to the Spanish stage, whose productions have here and there met with a reception among us in the nineteenth century, with which Lessing would not have been altogether contented. Here again he proceeds from particulars to generals, and supporting himself by the authority of Aristotle, develops and illustrates the nature of tragedy. He then shows the Germans how their admiration of Racine and Corneille is founded upon their esteem for Gottsched; and takes advantage of the favourable opportunity to introduce a critique of the last-mentioned writer.

We are indeed not a little astonished, when Lessing afterwards in a longer article recommends Diderot's tedious 'Father of a Family;' when we see, that by his recommendation a way was

opened to the public for the prosaic poetry, or colloquial novels of Kotzebue, Jünger, Iffland and others: but on further consideration we perceive that this great man saw further than we should have seen. His patriotism and his acquaintance with the people properly so called, with their difference from the higher classes, guided this deep-thinking judge of mankind. He saw that the high poetical and philosophic flight of the Greek tragic chorus, the heroic feelings of great souls, was not to be expected or required from a rude nation, in bondage to prosaic life, and withal melancholy and sensitive. Lessing was not indeed influenced by the usual idea of learned fellowship, that one hand washes the other, as might be supposed, from the excessive praise lavished upon him by Diderot; but he had two reasons for recommending this new mongrel species which was altogether unknown to his Aristotle.

First, Lessing thought with good reason, that Diderot's drama was better suited than the heroic tragedy of the ancient Greeks to the taste and feeling of the German nation, to their social relations, their prosaic life, and the mode of thinking amongst the majority of those who must ever be kept in view, if anything national is to be produced: he had also another reason; he could in this manner wage war against French life and the French theatre with their own weapons, through one of the most renowned Frenchmen. He had but to appeal to Diderot's severe and spirited attack upon the prevailing French manner, upon the academic declamation of his fellow-countrymen, their pompous versification, and their wonderful tragic characters, in order fully to reach his own patriotic object. In fact he devotes more than a hundred pages to a renewed examination of the prevailing theories of his time, and opposes them by something new; but it is clear that his object is not so much in reality the establishment of a new scholastic theory, as to exalt the life of the German people, for he then applies all that he has said especially to Germany.

The last-mentioned closing remarks were of far greater importance for the new life and new literature of the Germans in the last three decennia of the eighteenth century, than might be supposed from their title. This arose from the great circulation of the 'Dramaturgy,' first as a journal, and then as a book in two editions, and a reprint. The best proof of this will be found by reading the pieces which have been referred to, and

by seeing how admirably Lessing establishes the want of a properly national or common feeling (which, as he does not however say, sprang from the complete nonage of a people led by princes and their officials, like a flock of sheep), and then deduces the conclusion, that neither a proper German theatre, nor a drama in which the people should generally sympathize, was yet to be thought of, and that therefore if the appearance of a great dramatic poet was not to be despaired of, it was at least very uncertain of being realized.

Two years afterwards he began to work on his 'Emilia Galotti,' which appeared in the following year (1771): we shall however mention this piece and its relation to the new age hereafter, along with Göthe's 'Götz von Berlichingen,' and turn our attention at present to another and not less important labour of Lessing, for the promotion of mental and moral improvement. He had again resumed his antiquarian studies, and presently fell into a learned controversy with Klotz, which gave him occasion to enrich our language and literature with a masterpiece of wit and eloquence of that description which the ancients call invective. Demosthenes and Cicero, as is well known, were masters of that art: Rousseau, in his 'Letters to the Archbishop of Paris,' and his 'Letters from the Mountain,' in a language and style different from that of the ancient orators just named, roused the minds of men in a wonderful manner against his enemies; and 'Junius's Letters' will deserve to be read on account of their tone and style long after the miserable disputes which gave occasion to them have been forgotten. Lessing showed his great capacity in this species of writing on two occasions, first against Klotz, and a second time against Götze of Hamburg.

Neither Klotz nor Götze suspected that they immortalized Lessing at the very moment when he wholly annihilated them! We shall speak of his pamphlet against Götze hereafter, because it is intimately connected with the controversy respecting enlightenment and the right of examination and criticism in matters of faith, which Lessing so nobly and so zealously defended; his controversy with Klotz, on the other hand, here naturally falls under our notice, from its being contemporaneous with the 'Dramaturgy.' We have above alluded to the manner in which Klotz and his companions in Halle, and at a later period Riedel of Erfurt, misused their reviews. For from that

time forward reviews and periodicals ruled in Germany, and still more so in other countries. Klotz in particular not only dealt out praise and blame from his own sheets and his 'Library of the Fine Arts,' in a manner quite in accordance with his mean views, but also forced his opinions either directly or indirectly into every new periodical.

It is a well-known principle of the Klotzes of all times and countries, that whenever a distinguished genius appears, or a man threatens to become important, either to endeavour by abundant praise and thickly strewed incense to draw him within the limits of their society, or to cry him down by the grossest abuse, and by means of the influence which they have gained with the writers and readers of the periodical or daily press, to damage his reputation. This was attempted in Lessing's case. Klotz first endeavoured to allure him by praise; he and his clique however soon observed that the man was too independent to become their companion, and then Mr. privy-councillor Klotz, in the absurdly presuming manner of those who regard themselves as people of renown, threw out insinuations of all sorts against the 'Laocoon,' and by means of a well-known literary and diplomatic strategy, caused these to appear in various newspapers as if originating from various sources. Lessing at first kept silence; but when these contemptible men did not cease to attack him, he at last wrote his 'Antiquarian Letters,' which with his later writings against Götze, belong to the most distinguished pieces which have appeared in the German language, in the department of polemic eloquence, since the times of Luther and Hutten.

Lessing's 'Antiquarian Letters' were first sent by him to the Hamburg newspapers, 1768, but afterwards appeared as a separate work in two parts, and are not only worthy of admiration on account of their masterly wit, their admirable eloquence, and the art and vigour of their language, but also on account of their effect, and the attention which was awakened at that time by Lessing's method of treating a scientific subject. As to their effect, Klotz and his company were not only annihilated, but a new light was also shed upon single parts of ancient art, which had only begun to dawn in the 'Laocoon.' As to the representation, he had so moulded the form of his exposition, that every man who was at all acquainted with the subject, which would not have been in itself attractive,

was obliged to take part; and however much Klotz complains of rudeness and personalities, Lessing never goes further than the nature of the subject demands; and when people like Klotz wish to throw dust in the eyes of the public, how is it possible to separate the person from the thing, of which they avail themselves for the indulgence of their vanity? The ‘Antiquarian Letters’ are therefore an admirable scientific treatise on the question, and a masterly and witty satire.

In the same way as Lessing understood how to interest the great German public and all laymen, in questions which related to the science of antiquities, without making any concession in the smallest degree prejudicial to science, he knew also how to awaken general attention towards a scholastic theological treatise, although himself was no theologian. The art of enlivening and recommending an apparently dry subject by means of exposition, language and form, which had been hitherto wholly unknown in Germany, makes the announcement of a work of Berengarius Turonensis, which Lessing had found among the manuscripts of the Wolfenbüttel library, a remarkable fact in the history of the rapid development of German literature in the beginning of the seventh decennium.

It was indeed no small task to win a public, to take an interest in antiquated scholastic theological controversies, such as Berengarius’ work against Lanfranc upon the body and blood of Christ, and yet Lessing successfully surmounted the difficulty in his announcement.

Lessing made a complete work of art of this learned treatise; he sets before us the difficulties, which he then resolves with surprising ingenuity and skill. It had previously been believed that Berengarius, subdued by the sentence of the spiritual authorities, had never afterwards risen up against Lanfranc; the proper difficulty is to keep alive the interest and attention of the reader upon a question about which nobody, beyond the limits of the church and schools, any longer troubled himself. In the following period we must refer to other important works of this great man; we must here in the conclusion of the present period return for a moment to Herder, because in a similar way about the same time, he either set himself in opposition to the ‘Antiquarian Letters’ of Lessing, as well as to his criticisms upon *belles lettres*, or put himself forward so as to challenge comparison with him.

Herder in his 'Fragments' had neither passed judgement upon Lessing's contributions to the 'Letters upon Literature,' nor presented himself as a rival, but he published his 'Views of Art in the Critical Groves' in opposition to Lessing's 'Laocoon.' These 'Critical Groves' appeared in 1769, and the first small volume is exclusively devoted to the 'Laocoon.' Even if we could venture to enter the field of antiquarian research, we cannot do so in this place, since our object is neither to treat of art or poetry as such, but only of the progress of German culture, which is inseparable from the improvement of our language, and from the approximation of our literature to that of neighbouring countries. We speak therefore alone of the form in which Lessing and Herder clothed their remarks, in order to instruct the great public, and especially the educated classes, in the philosophy of art.

Lessing proceeds in a lively, but always gentle and thoughtful manner, from proposition to proposition, from conclusion to conclusion, and continues to the last pithy and concise; Herder repeats himself, writes in that style which is called figurative, addresses himself to the fancy more than to the understanding, and we observe in him indications of a species of writing, which is devoid of simplicity and deliberation,—a style in which Jean Paul went to a length which no other nation would have tolerated. Some of our historians also, and among them Johannes von Müller, have attempted to adorn nature, and have often written in the manner of Greeks or Romans; he alone, however, was peculiar in his art, and no mere trickery is ever observable in him as in the historian, nor intoxication as in the humourist.

The first small volume of the 'Critical Groves' may have largely contributed to test and rectify many of Lessing's views and conclusions, because Herder proves himself to be a young man of great talents; the work has at least retained its value, as an able and spirited accessory to the 'Laocoon.' The second and third volumes of these 'Critical Groves,' which are especially directed against Klotz, have no longer the importance which Lessing's 'Antiquarian Letters' possess, for every friend of antiquity and of the German literature and language. Herder was not strong enough in his subject to make Klotz important to posterity, as Lessing did. He was indeed superior to him in mind and imagination, but inferior in a solid knowledge of the ancient languages and the science of antiquity.

Herder, notwithstanding his youth, by the publication of his 'Prize-essay upon the Origin of Language', secured himself that place beside Lessing in the following year (1770), which he had zealously laboured to attain. This essay is remarkable as being the best, perhaps the only, refutation of Rousseau's 'Paradoxes upon the Natural Condition of Man, and upon the Disadvantage of the Progressive Development of the Powers of the Human Mind.'

We conclude the history of the progressive mental and moral culture of our nation in the period from 1756—1771, with a few remarks upon Klopstock, who was behind the age, although he had then attained the summit of his reputation; and in the following period enjoyed an extensive and European, and for that reason fruitless renown. He published the last two volumes of his 'Messiah,' and the greater portion of his odes, which are for the most part heavy, from 1769—1773, by which he undoubtedly gained great credit, rendered valuable services to our language, and promoted the improvement of the learned part of the nation: the extent of these services we shall not here determine; we do not dwell upon them, partly because Klopstock's merits have been sufficiently treated of in the preceding period, partly because his writings belong wholly to that time and indicate no real advance, and partly because Klopstock's influence in reference to form, versification, and language, is not immediately connected with the progress of the following periods.

Klopstock, indeed, within this time tried his powers in other species of poetry than the epic dogmatic and difficult lyric, which latter could not be understood without an accurate acquaintance with Greek metres; but this new species also belonged to the old church and school times, and not to the new and vigorous life. Klopstock wrote for example dramatic poetry, or at least poems which had the appearance of a drama; in 1757, 'The Death of Adam;' in 1764, his 'Solomon;' in 1768, 'Hermann's Battle, a bard song;' in 1772, 'David.' But the time of Old and New Testament poets and poetry was past, and people saw too clearly, what was needed for the present, how far the hired and mercenary soldiers of the German princes in the seven years' war were from all the conceptions of a heroic age, how far the use of the Prussian corporal's cane was and yet is from true freedom, to permit them with pleasure to think,

and much less to rejoice, that two thousand years ago Hermann had once defeated the Romans. For these reasons, the songs and heroic deeds of the ancient free German people in their forests and marshes, 'Hermann's Battle,' 'Hermann and the Princes,' 'Hermann's Death,' although they might form a regular trilogy after the Grecian fashion, could call forth no response in the hearts of the people, for Hermann's forests were cleared and his freedom gone. Klopstock's time demanded a poetry and history in accordance with the spirit of the new age, which might deserve to be called the instructress of life; the generation after us will probably again seek for the opposite kind, and a library for its use has been already written, because it will at least require a few years to read all the books which have been lately written to fix the place where Hermann defeated Varus, and upon other questions of equally weighty and vital import.

PART THE SECOND.

PROGRESS AND NATURE OF INTELLECTUAL IMPROVEMENT AND LITERATURE.

CHAPTER I.

ENGLAND.

§ I.

NOVELS AND HUMOUR.

WITH the increase of the number of writers in England in the course of the eighteenth century, women began to appear as authors instead of educating their children, and their influence upon morals and modes of thinking increased, as that of the clergy diminished. England also, like our native land, felt the influence of a Rousseau and a Voltaire; after having long admired Montesquieu, it took the so-called philosophers, Cyclopedists and Economists of France, for its preceptors. At the risk of repeating something of what has already been touched upon, we shall once more cast a hasty glance upon the English literature of the second half of the eighteenth century. In the hasty mention which has been made of the novels and of the saloons, it will have been already seen, that the time was not favourable to serious modes of life or writing, and that all the higher classes, as well as all who aimed at educational distinction, imitated the Parisian tone. In this manner all individuality speedily disappeared from life as well as from literature; and every thing assumed a general character. Nature and simplicity were obliged to give way to art and artificiality, effect alone was universally considered, feeling soon became of less value than sentimentality, and a clever and polished lie more profitable than truth. The changed modes of life rendered a different description of literature necessary, and a changed litera-

ture in its turn altered the condition and circumstances of life. Every thing, which in this glance at the subjects of literary pursuit, may appear as satire or censure, was, however, suited to the time; and what is blamed, when considered in another point of view, was admirably fitted to the circumstances, and therefore possessed qualities which something better would not have had. It is unnecessary to repeat this remark in each individual case; because the prevailing opinions and views, as well as the reputation of so many persons, both men and women, who are here in some degree censured, are proclaimed in hundreds of books, and are altogether beyond the reach of any reproach from an individual. Our remarks affect the subject alone, not the persons.

There was in England, as well as in France, a great public, whose judgement upon books and authors was decisive. This public did not consist, as in the times of the Greeks and Romans, of a select number of men who had gained experience in life, and especially in the management of great national affairs, and a correct taste by the study of philosophy, and by deep and long thinking. In this changed state of society, considered in one point of view, a great progress was indeed made. Because every thing lay in the form, the form was perfected, and the number of educated persons was great; but at the same time literature became a speculation for gain or reputation. The people were led astray as to what right and truth properly were, and the disputes which arose with regard to them were like a lawsuit, which is decided, not according to the sense of truth implanted in us, but to the best pleading of the best advocate. Trivial and light reading, besides, made men loose in their judgements; authors ceased to yield obedience to an inward impulse, nor did especially seek to satisfy the thinking, but to please the multitude; they had no longer need of any true inspiration, but only of a prudent and tradesmanlike consideration. They were obliged to please trivial readers—to keep outward ends or the tone of certain societies ever in their eye.

As regards England in particular, we have pointed out in the first volume the manner in which, at the very beginning of the eighteenth century, the so-called academic taste of the French, introduced by Steele, Addison and Bolingbroke, forced itself into English literature, together with a continual striving after the more pleasing and rhetorical form of the French writers, and how Pope, instead of Milton, became at the same

time the Homer and the Horace of the nation. This has been too briefly treated for the period immediately succeeding, and we must now therefore return to what has been said, in order to extend, complete, and continue it. We remark first, that the code of courtly morality, of cold aristocratic worldly prudence, which Lord Chesterfield left behind him in his letters to his son, to his fellow-countrymen of his own rank, and to those who wished to practise it, appeared just about the same time (1772), that under the ministry of Lord North, all consistency and shame seem to have departed from those who in England appoint both parliaments and ministry from their circle. It is remarkable enough, that this admirably written and highly polished sharper's morality became the fashion in England, along with the sentimentality of a Sterne and the gloomy religiousness of a Young, and that Richardson's novels were at the same time in every one's hands. We must here once more mention the novels of Fielding and Richardson, and especially because those novels were generally circulated in bad translations in those parts of Germany, which at that time, as at present, were distinguished for their Anglomania, viz. in Hamburg, Hanover, Brunswick, and other parts of Northern Germany.

The English novel, alas! was, even as at present, the only picture and the only instructor of a giddy life, in the case not only of many individuals, but of whole ranks and classes. The novel shows, like other kinds of literature, the progress of the age from the natural to the fictitious—from true and practical morality to moralising and effeminacy—from feeling to affected sentimentality. Without going into particulars, or even analysing the novels of Goldsmith and Smollet, which belong properly to this class, this shows itself clearly in the novel-writers already mentioned, and in their productions. Smollet differs from Fielding only in things of which we are not at present treating, but in what concerns our present purpose, every thing which is said of Fielding holds good also of him; Goldsmith, however, belongs to a class of practised book-writers, who swarm in England, France and Germany. Fielding conceived life as it was, with great strength and distinctness, and brought out into clear light those contrasts which are indeed now well enough known, but which were then remarked by none, because England was regarded as a paradise—a Utopia. He showed with such power the difference between appearance

and truth—between a flattering clergy and true religion, that the lovers of sentimentality and the multitude, who are always willing to have their eyes bound that they may dream pleasantly, were in some measure driven from himself to his countryman Richardson, the discoverer of a conventional morality. We cannot therefore wonder that Fielding, who died in 1754, found a public in Germany much later than Richardson, whose moralising and sentimental heroes and heroines had already become the fashion by means of Rousseau, at the same time with the idyllic dreams of Gessner. We must possess good practical sense and a knowledge of pure old English life, and of the abuses of its hierarchy and clergy, to understand Fielding, to estimate a ‘Joseph Andrews’ and a ‘Tom Jones,’ and to find pleasure in them; whereas we have only need of indefinite general notions and sensibility, to admire Richardson’s ‘Pamela,’ and his ‘Sir Charles Grandison.’

The changed condition of the times procured a place for a Glover and a Thomson beside Shakespeare and Milton; and it also caused the name of Richardson to be placed along with those of Fielding and Smollet, and clearly shows that Richardson was obliged to wait for a favourable conjuncture. When the French rhetorical manner first became prevalent, by means of the ladies and the coteries which we have already mentioned, and an intelligible, correct and grammatical style of poetry took the place of an inspired one, by means of Johnson who was a dictator in those circles, then Richardson’s novels were admired. He was born about 1689, but only ventured before the public with his ‘Pamela’ when he was fifty years old, and even at that time did not find his countrymen ripe for that description of morality and sentiment which he appeared to recommend. He found such bitter opponents that he became frightened, and did not again try his fortune as an author for eight years. During this interval his time had come, and towards the end of the seven years’ war, about which period Richardson died, ‘Clarissa Harlowe’ and ‘Sir Charles Grandison’ excited as much attention as the two novels of Rousseau, and Diderot’s dramas; and thus the operation of the rhetorical sentimental tone prevailing in France, and that in vogue from England, were contemporaneous. At the same time with these moralising immoral novels, somewhat after the manner of Kotzebue, there arose in England the singular manifestation of

that melodramatic humour which sprung from a man who was both preacher and witling, and who bore precisely the same relation in his kind and manner to old English life and to the old views of religion, as Richardson and Fielding did in theirs. Sterne banished the gloomy sentimentality of the author of the 'Night Thoughts,' which made the name of Young of so much value to our Klopstocks and Lavaters, and replaced it by a jesting sentimentality. Sterne dared not fall into the obscurity and confusion of the German humourists from Hamann to Jean Paul Richter, from fear of the English public, which will not allow itself to be deluded, like the German; but he was far also from reaching the depth and true poetry which his German imitators often exhibit in the few places which a reader can understand, who does not make it his business to study the peculiarities of genius and learning. We mention Sterne's writings here with no view to go minutely into them, or to try them according to the rules of taste, which we leave to others; but as a proof and sign that as early as the time of the seven years' war, the necessity was felt in England, as well as in France and Germany, of supporting the church and its machinery, by means of morality and sentiment, and the state by constitutional theories.

Sterne's chief work, 'Tristram Shandy,' of which the first two volumes appeared about 1760, made my uncle Toby, who plays the chief part therein, a sort of historical personage, who will hardly, if ever, disappear from English life, from literature and history. In this work, Sterne employed a mixture of wit and scandal, of morality and immorality, of sermons and satires, and worked upon his readers in the same way as Fielding in his novels, but from another direction and upon a different public. It fared with his writings precisely as with those of Wieland, Diderot, and Rousseau. Sterne was a clergyman, but nevertheless, his colleagues the parsons and all Englishmen of the genuine old school, raised a terrible outcry against him. All persons of seriousness, especially the regular church and king shouting Englishmen, regarded this mixing up of slippery representations, of mournful scenes, and sermonised morality, as in the highest degree offensive; but they were regarded as wrong by the public, because Sterne had been progressive with the spirit of the times, and they had remained stationary. In the year after the appearance of the first two volumes of

his 'Tristram Shandy,' Sterne, by the title-page of a new book, proved to these outcriers how much the whole inward structure of that dead church and of its forms, to which a genuine Englishman cleaves as he does to his party newspaper, was already tottering. This book was his sentimental and humorous sermons, upon the title-page of which he had used the novel as a sign, in order to gain admission for his sermons. No one took offence at this; on the contrary, the volumes of 'Tristram Shandy,' which in the year 1767 had grown to nine, procured a good living for their author in England, and the reputation of the most humorous of writers in the whole of Europe.

Moreover, here is also to be seen the difference between a people entirely employed in the business of life, in trade and commerce, experienced in judiciary and civil affairs, acquainted with the laws and constitution of their country, and therefore living in the clearness and light of the understanding, and a people brooding in the darkness of their closets, educated by pedants, and governed by officials according to rescripts and cabinet orders. Our humourists might write whole libraries and bring to light the most extraordinary materials without offence, Sterne already found fewer favourable readers for the last, and small volumes of his 'Tristram,' which perhaps are the best of the work. That part of the English public which loved fictitious feeling, and forced wit announced in the title, longed for a change of form and materials. Sterne, when he had exhausted his humorous vein, helped himself by means of another—he wrote an account of a journey. Immediately after the last part of the somewhat offensive 'Tristram Shandy' (1767), there appeared an English 'Siegwart,' or Sterne's so-called 'Sentimental Journey.'

This new work was read with much greater curiosity through the whole of Europe than 'Tristram Shandy,' precisely because it contained less that was purely national, local and peculiar, and had passed over into a weak and colourless character of generality, which the newest literature of the English, French and Germans adopted in the last decennia, though it had been peculiar to the Italians since the seventeenth century. In other words we would say, that the good reception of the 'Sentimental Journey' in England proves, that there also a general and feeble education of the great multitude, instead of the classical education of a small number, became prevalent, or that in-

stead of a severe and manly judgement, effeminacy of mind began to prevail, as in France, because a conventional and social education had entered into and occupied the place of a classical one. Moreover, the 'Sentimental Journey' was greeted much more joyfully in Germany and France than in England, because the melo-drama, invented in France, which was contemporaneous with it, and Rousseau's novels, which had just then appeared, paved its way, and in Germany it was quite suited to the numerous imitations of 'Werther' and 'Siegwart,' and to the innumerable poems, histories and novels of the sentimental period.

The influence of Sterne and others was besides instantaneous only in a land of egotism and of fast-standing forms and limits; for, that mode of life which Fielding had delineated with such a masterly hand, was too intimately bound up with the life and being of the nation, to allow sentimentality at any time to penetrate the mass of the traders and farmers of England. It was restrained by that stiff and rigid church spirit, which the English themselves mark as Jewish, by calling Sunday their Sabbath, and by their uniformity of a liturgy; whereas in Germany, on the other hand, it was much required by rationalism, as it is called in religion, and by the new modes of thinking which originated in the time of Basedow, Wolfe, Campe and Salzmann.

These few general observations on the direction which the English novel writers gave or profited by, show sufficiently, that in England also, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the ruggedness of its nationality had disappeared from its literature, and that it had passed over into the general rhetorical character of the French, and that diffusiveness now universally prevails. With this new direction of the English education, which more and more approximated to the French in spite of all efforts and outcries, and which was formed for society and light conversation, a portion of their literature and criticism must necessarily fall to the share of the women as had long ago happened in France. In fact, the desire to shine in and by means of the coteries, since the time of the seven years' war, had extended from Paris to London. We shall cast a glance upon these coteries before we speak of the historical, political and other reflective or descriptive writings composed in imitation of the French.

§ II.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE SO-CALLED ENGLISH BLUE STOCKINGS.

The English world of fashion was so closely connected with that of the French, that in London, as in Paris, it must have been favourable to men of polished manners and academicians, to ladies and talkers. Bolingbroke was the English Voltaire; Shelburne, Wilkes, the whole English aristocracy of the early part of the reign of George III., stood in close union with Paris, where the Walpoles had already done homage to French taste and principles. The Popes and their friends were already ruling in the coteries in Walpole's time; and even before the seven years' war, the society at Twickenham was as celebrated as that of Madame du Deffant. In the house of Lady Mary Wortley Montague, at Twickenham, some twelve miles from London, there assembled Addison, Steele, Pope, Young and others, who were desirous of introducing the elegant rhetorical French literature to their fellow-countrymen, in an English form and in a smoother language, constructed more after the principles of the French grammar. Lady Wortley Montague, who then led the conversations at Twickenham, was not yet known to the world by her celebrated travels published in the form of letters, for this work appeared two years after her death: but she was esteemed as a benefactress to Europe, in consequence of the introduction of inoculation for the small pox. She was, as is well known, the wife of an English minister plenipotentiary in Constantinople, and first described, from actual knowledge, the Turkish harems, which she had visited; she was also mistress of the Turkish language. In these assemblies at Twickenham, Pope was, what D'Alembert, at a later period, became in the house of Madame P'Espinasse. The assemblies ceased when Pope and Lady Mary disagreed, and she went to Italy, where she lived for twenty years. Her travels, which were published by Cleland two years after her death, about 1763, have without doubt received their elegant form from the file of the editor, and the fourth part of the whole is certainly to be attributed to Cleland himself. A few remarks will be sufficient, with respect to the later writings of the English ladies and the nature and arrangements of the coteries formed according to Parisian

style, where educated ladies, fashionable literary gentlemen, and celebrated authors, rivalling each other in the strife of vanity, exhibited their powers of conversation, and boasted of their connexion with similar societies in Paris.

Gibbon and Morellet, in their memoirs, give us some account of the connexion between the Parisian and London literati, and of those aristocratic coteries, consisting of women, fashionable gentlemen and vain authors, who, after the seven years' war, in London as well as in Paris, claimed the monopoly of all free thought and expression. In addition to these hints, which are sufficient for our purpose, Hume and many others, especially Horace Walpole, who like our Gotha Grimm, or in later times Baron von Grimm, was the very ideal of the Parisian saloons, give us sketches of them in their letters. The most distinguished among the ladies who assembled persons remarkable for their talents in their houses in London, was Mrs. Elizabeth Montague, who immediately after the peace first made a house in Paris, to use the fashionable expression of the time, before she led the *ton* in London, from the years 1772–1785. The same class of people was the fashion in London and in Paris; and whether their merits be recognised or not, they were celebrated in both cities just at the time in which the influence of the court, in consequence of its adherence to the stiffness of old usages, was the least in both places. Gibbon and Garrick were loaded with honours in Paris, and Morellet, the weakest of all the academicians, cannot find words enough to boast of his reception in London (1770). Shelburne and Col. Barré, well known as being, together with Fox, the warmest opponents of the North ministry, and the favourers of the principles of American freedom, everywhere introduced the man who had been recommended by Turgot, Holbach and Helvetius; and it is impossible to read this vain writer without a smile, when he describes how the celebrated people of London honoured him as if he had been their own*. We must read, as related by himself, how he was daily with Garrick, with Banks and Solander, the companions of Cook

* Because he names those whom we must also often mention, we shall quote his words. 'Mémoires de l'Abbé Morellet.' Paris, Ladvocat, 1821, 2 voll. 8vo. vol. i. ch. 9. p. 204.—" Nous déjeunions tous les jours avec quelques-uns de ses (Shelburne's) amis, Barré, Priestley, le docteur Price, Franklin, les deux Townsend, l'alderman, et le ministre, &c. Le dîner rassemblait encore une compagnie plus nombreuse, et les femmes retirées, la conversation était bonne, variée, instructive."

on his voyage round the world, how he breakfasted with the Duke of Richmond, Lord Mansfield and Lord Sandwich, and associated with the people who were then distinguished as liberal writers; all was after the Parisian fashion,—one hand washed the other.

Elizabeth Montague, who practised in London what she had learned in Paris with the great applause of all those literary gentlemen who loved a good kitchen and witty conversation, was the daughter of a rich landowner in Yorkshire, but was incorporated into the aristocracy, to which also her whole circle belonged, by her marriage with Edward Montague, grandson of the first Earl of Sandwich. The reproach of learned negligence (of blue stockings) could not properly be cast upon this circle where persons were accustomed to appear in full dress and with their hair frizzed and powdered. By means of her table, and the whole arrangement of her house in Paris, she even eclipsed the farmer-general; and Gibbon reports, that people were astonished at the enormous amount of her yearly income, which appeared to be still greater by her pounds sterling being reckoned in French money. She was equal to conversation on every subject; but she assumed that dogmatic and presumptuous tone which is well known as peculiar to learned English ladies, and even to young English tourists. We cannot therefore properly reckon Dr. Johnson among the number of her clients, who was at that time the ruling despot of English taste, criticism and critical conversation, and who could not endure the slightest contradiction, or even an opinion which deviated from his own. Mrs. Montague also appeared as an authoress, and tried to defend her countryman Shakespeare (in her ‘Essay on the Genius and Writings of Shakespeare’) against Voltaire, and she was regarded, in England and France at the same time, as an authority in all matters of taste; because both the dictators in literature, Voltaire in France, and Johnson in England, had thought it worth while to break a lance with her.

Johnson, who was almost as much deified and worshiped in England as Voltaire in France, was the true image, and is yet the *idéal*, of a genuine John Bull; intelligent, learned, correct, but severe, rude, and prejudiced, a poet without poetry, and an orator without inspiration. This fully appeared afterwards, when his most absurd worshiper and silly biographer, Boswell, informs us of the manner in which he spoke of Mrs. Montague’s

‘Essay on Shakespeare,’ (in defence of which he would hear nothing,) with a bitterness and severity peculiar to himself. Voltaire replied, immediately after the appearance of the ‘Essay,’ in a controversial dissertation, (‘Nouvelle Lettre. à l’Académie’) prefixed to his ‘Irene.’

Earls, barons, and their literature, naturally held the first place in a circle such as this, which first assembled in a splendid mansion in Hill-street, and afterwards in the noble palace which Mrs. Montague built for herself in the neighbourhood of Portman-square, where persons were dressed as it was universally the custom in England to appear, till Fox brought the dress of a Franklin into fashion. Every one came in a stiff English court dress; and Mrs. Montague, in tasteless but splendid attire, led the conversation in a decisive and manly tone. The half French aristocratic conversation of the drawing-room was already indicated by the picture of the Earl of Bath, which hung in the room, to show that this distinguished writer, who died before Mrs. Montague’s return from Paris, ranked among the friends of the lady of the house. We must leave the delineation of the characteristics of the individuals who composed this illustrious circle, to Englishmen, who, as is well known, push to the highest degree of absurdity, the trade in small wares, in the way of histories and curious narratives of particular neighbourhoods and places, and in biographies of individuals, statesmen, poets, actors, &c.; we shall confine ourselves to two names, which sufficiently point out the Parisian direction of this distinguished circle.

The man who on canvass patronized the society had belonged to the licentious and weathercock sect of Parisian sophists and satirists. The Earl of Bath was Pulteney, so well known by his virulent satires in the time of Walpole, and who, as soon as his enemy was removed from power, became the admirer of a court which he had formerly bitterly calumniated and made contemptible, because he himself was made a privy councillor, and created Earl of Bath. One of the leading members of the society was Lord Lyttleton, who was celebrated as the author of a History of Henry the Second, the value of which it does not belong to this inquiry to estimate, in which we are speaking only of the tone and direction of society in the last decennia of the eighteenth century. Two other books, which made Lyttleton known, betray the French style at the first glance: first,

his 'Dialogues of the Dead,' in which we might very easily point out the French influence; and the second, which was very extensively circulated in France in several translations, immediately reminds us by its title-page, of an old French acquaintance. This was his 'New Persian Letters,' an imitation of Montesquieu's first, and also his most indifferent book.

There was a second London coterie, which was genuine English and less aristocratic, and in which the conversation was less formal. This was the society of Mrs. Vesey, who had by far too much of the English feeling of deference for everything fashionable and distinguished, to permit her to think of rivalling Mrs. Montague. In her house Dr. Johnson, in himself alone an aristocracy of a particular kind, reigned in all the fullness of his schoolmaster-like majesty. Mrs. Vesey was courtly neither in manners, tone, or apparel, nor was her society, although it made an epoch in London as a learned ladies' coterie; those who visited it were the first who received the highly appropriate name for learned women of "Blue stockings," of whom there is now a legion in England. Mrs. Vesey entertained her guests, not splendidly, but remarkably well; and as she did not always put herself under restraint in speaking, Doctor Johnson's severity and warmth in her house were so completely in place, that it was there especially he delivered those oracular sayings which Boswell has collected, as if they were pearls and diamonds. Boswell has by far outstripped the collectors of all the trifles, personal anecdotes and miserable nothings which refer to Göthe, and the English have, as thankfully and with as much curiosity, swallowed every triviality about this much-admired and worshiped critic and artist in taste and literature, as the Germans every trifling anecdote about their greatest poet and prose-writer. We are therefore in a condition to judge of the tone and taste of this circle, which had not yet quite advanced to Parisian refinement, from the then endured and even admired sayings of Johnson, although we are not unjust enough to wish to identify with these judgements the character of Old England, and the manners and taste of John Bull. The sayings themselves however still remain a curiosity in reference to the taste which the English ladies learned from their oracle; and especially the beautiful Duchess of Devonshire, who at that time altogether hung upon his lips; at the same time we see, that the genuine English church-and-king spirit of this circle, which was led by

Dr. Johnson, was far worse than the spirit of the times which favoured freedom and warred against prejudice.

Johnson called every man a "rascal" who did not strive with him and with the enemies of all toleration and improvement, as madly as a monk, against all progress; blindly repeating the celebrated party motto of the unimproveables, "church and king," he employed this opprobrious epithet to characterize the noble enthusiasts Lord William Russel and Algernon Sydney, those ever-to-be-admired men, great even in confounding the ideal great with the actually possible. He called Fielding, who unhappily was too much exposed to censure on the ground of morality, but whose capacities as a writer were only discussed in that circle, because in his 'Tom Jones,' he had represented the condition of the English peasantry and the religion of the aristocratic parsons in all their nakedness, and had delineated them with a master's hand,—he called Fielding "a blockhead and a barren rascal." The title "dog" was regarded by him as a proper appellation for many. We can well understand that a society, which was under the despotic guidance of such an absolutely loyal man, must have been ill-suited for a Hume and a Gibbon; Burke, who found it at that time expedient to be liberal, and who besides was not calculated to shine in unstudied speech, was seldom seen there. As Johnson gave the tone in Mrs. Vesey's circle as well as in that of Mrs. Thrale, we can well judge of the tone which prevailed in those societies from which the Queen afterwards selected Miss Burney, as suitable to herself and her husband. In that society every one who did not remain unconditionally fast by what was old—every liberal-minded person—was not only an erring man, but a criminal; and what Johnson thought of Fox and such-like men, we learn from Boswell's report of one of his sayings, viz. that he would rather sit at table with the hangman than with Wilkes. The English small traders in anecdotes have therefore not neglected to record it as a remarkable fact, that Johnson and Wilkes were once brought together at table. We now pass on to the circle of Mrs. Thrale, afterwards Piozzi.

Mrs. Thrale, who owed her education to the terrible Johnson, and her reputation also, because at that time he alone could raise or ruin people by his word, retired at a later period to Florence, to get out of his way. This lady, first known as a writer as Mrs. Piozzi, on her return to London after Piozzi's death

published in 1786 a whole volume of anecdotes about Johnson. This book is not quite so silly as Boswell's celebrated and much-read 'Life of Johnson;' but we learn from it how the present prevailing manner of painting and delineation, the art of making the little great and the great little, sprung from those circles in which the prosaic soul of Johnson pronounced what was obvious and common-place beautiful. This lady was first married to a Mr. Thrale, a rich brewer in Southwark, and, as the child of parents without property, had received very little instruction in her youth; when therefore she became the wife of a member of parliament, and made a house, Johnson, who became acquainted with her, devoted himself at some sacrifice to her education, trumpeted her fame abroad as a learned lady, and thus drew many into the circle and society of Mrs. Thrale. For this she showed her gratitude to the uncouth grammarian and critic. He even lived for some considerable time in her house. Mrs. Thrale, like Mrs. Vesey, had also a Johnsonian circle; but after she had buried her first husband, she married her music-master Piozzi, a Florentine, at which Johnson was so enraged, that she avoided him, and as Mrs. Piozzi sought to make a reputation by writing.

The society of Mrs. Thrale, both at her country residence at Streatham and in town, was celebrated over all Europe; and her house, like that of Helvetius in Paris, was so much visited, that there Garrick was usually to be found, who was more deeply versed in Shakspeare and a better actor than any man in the eighteenth century. He would have been still oftener there, if he had not been somewhat deterred by the despotism which Johnson, who was entertained and cherished by Mr. Thrale, exercised in the assemblies of his wife. As Mrs. Thrale opened her societies at an earlier period than Mrs. Montague, the Earl of Bath was there not merely in portrait but in person, and immediately after the seven years' war Mrs. Thrale accompanied him on a tour through Germany. In this circle there also shone Mrs. Carter, who owed her first reputation to some articles in 'The Gentleman's Magazine;' but who during the seven years' war, in consequence of her translation of Epictetus, had already received the somewhat oddly sounding title of the English Madame Dacier (1758). We cannot allow ourselves to enter upon the writings of this lady, but only incidentally remark, that she died in 1806, and that in her memoirs, published after her death,

there are contained some hints and notices of great importance to the history of the period, in which the otherwise serious and pure English literature by the help of the ladies assumed its present general European character. The most important thing in the history of these coteries is this, that it became the fashion in England and an honour to be introduced into the circle, and as such was eagerly coveted; as it is well known, that amongst Britons, more than amongst any other people, persons most anxiously long to stand in any corner at court, and to have their names announced in the newspapers, or to make acquaintance with distinguished men. In and through such a circle a man attains a sort of national importance, and is then regularly sought after in his turn.

Among those who shone in this circle, we must not pass over the family of the Burneys, on account of the daughter who afterwards came to court. The father was the celebrated musician and author of the 'History of Music,' who afterwards received the title of Musical Doctor; one of the sons became an admiral, the other was a theologian and known as an author, but particularly remarkable as the founder of the still existing literary journal, 'The Monthly Review.' The daughter has been very recently recalled to the memory of all those circles which resemble that of Mrs. Thrale. At the time of these coteries Miss Burney and her father generally played mute characters, as well as the deaf painter Reynolds; for Johnson was very loud, and the Duchess of Portland, whose youth and beauty had been once sung by Swift and Prior, desired, now in her age, to shine in this circle by her talents, as the young Duchess of Devonshire did by her beauty. The circle, however, helped Miss Burney to a kind of posthumous fame. She wrote 'Evelina' and 'Cecilia,' and these books were brought into reputation by this circle in England, in the same manner as Klammer Schmidt's poems by means of his acquaintance with Klopstock, or Tiedge's 'Urania' by the favour of the Saxons. The grand-daughter has lately presented us with three volumes, full of the most arrant trifles and gossiping from the life of this Miss Burney, afterwards Madame d'Arblay, which we have here mentioned, because extracts from the book* have been given in all the English newspapers and reviews, and even in the French 'National,' since July 1842.

* 'Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay, Authoress of 'Evelina,' 'Cecilia,' &c. Edited by her Niece.' 3 vols. 1842.

We would dwell longer on the book, because it contains much relating to Johnson and Reynolds and Mrs. Thrale, at whose house she also saw Paoli and Burke, whom she describes, if it were not that the greatest part of the work consists of gossip about the interior of tedious royal housekeeping, and of the quarrels with Mrs. von Schwellenberg, which are magnified into importance, and which can only interest an English public. When Madame de Hagedorn resigned her office of keeper of the robes in 1786, Queen Charlotte sought for some one who might also be of some use to the princesses, and one of the ladies of the loyal circle of Mrs. Thrale, the widow of Dean Delany, recommended Miss Burney. To this circle also belonged the ill-looking Esther Chapone, who wrote a novel when she was only nine years old, and afterwards moralized in the manner of Dr. Johnson; but notwithstanding died in great poverty in the year 1801. Miss Shipley, daughter and afterwards wife of a man of learning, was not precipitated into poverty at least by her education and authorship; her father, who was also sometimes at Mrs. Thrale's, was Bishop of St. Asaph, and she married the celebrated Sir W. Jones, renowned for his knowledge of Indian and Oriental antiquities and languages, and who was so grossly mystified by the Bramins. Further, to the learned ladies of this circle belonged the wife of Boscawen, known as an author and translator.

If we would state the effect of the learning and literature among the ladies of this circle, under the leading of Dr. Johnson, it may be said to have consisted in an intelligent mediocrity, superficial clearness, moralizing verbosity, and an indefatigable rhetoric, in delineation and description. This circle, established in London from the years 1770 and 1785, from which the yet existing literature of the world, so called, sprung in its quiet, diffuse, intellectually instructive, but never vigorous and sometimes wearisome tone (Lord Byron alone brought some genius to his labours), stood very far below the contemporaneous conversational societies of Paris, which gave a tone to literature and were much sought by strangers. One cannot therefore wonder that a Horace Walpole, a moon, whose borrowed light was a reflection of the Parisian sun, shone in London as that luminary himself. Horace Walpole's letters, which are still highly valued, his reminiscences, to which constant appeals are yet made, his flashes of wit, which are still regarded as spirited, may show,

that what the English despise in the Germans as obscurity, grubbing and speculation, as philosophical pedantry and love of system, had still its value for our nation. As to the manner of the Walpole letter-writing and affectation, circumstances also were very favourable to giving it a somewhat genius-like and magnificent direction, because his father was minister, and as such, as is well known, held genuine diplomatic principles, which were immeasurably far removed from everything that was citizen-like or common. In these circles there appeared, for a whole winter through, one of the greatest prattlers of the Parisian saloons, the Abbé Raynal, who also visited Frederick the Second in Sans-souci; but the zealous church-and-king ladies found him as intolerable as he proved to Frederick.

§ III.

ROBERTSON—HUME—GIBBON.

The change of literature in England in relation to private and political life appears most distinctly in the direction and tone of the three great historians, and particularly in the universal applause which Gibbon received, who by combining English industry and solidity with an education altogether French, first fully accomplished what Voltaire earnestly desired but was never able to attain. Gibbon alone properly belongs to this period; but although Robertson and Hume have been previously noticed, it is notwithstanding necessary, in order to make the change and the progress distinct, here to point out their influence and efforts, regarded from a point of view different from that from which they have been previously considered.

Robertson, although he died as late as 1793, belonged in no respect to what we have named the French direction of the period after the seven years' war. He was, and remained, in every relation a Scotchman. He never left his own country, was a clergyman in the Calvinistic Reformed Church of Scotland, kept his intelligent, practical, reflecting and speculating public fast in his eye, and therefore worked quietly, correctly,

and in a manner suited to the taste of a public formed in the Scotch and English universities and in parliamentary debates. He wrote in a good, regular style, with perfectly well-balanced periods, in which every figure and trope found the proper place assigned it by Quintilian. Like all prudent mediocrity, he was idolized by the great reading world. He neither could nor would deviate from the beaten path, or disagreeably rouse, that is, offend, any man, by an unaccustomed view of human things. He wrote, not for the small number of thinkers and inquirers, but wished to be useful to practical men in the affairs of practical life, and he gained his object most completely. His service, therefore, in reference to the progress of the time, consists rather in his having paved the way to what was new, than in having entered upon the path himself, or given extension to the new spirit of the age. His public were the so-called persons of education, diplomatists and statesmen, who neither wished to be compelled to deep thinking about human impulses and affairs, to be startled by the lofty soarings of thought, nor by any doubts to be led astray with respect to the ancient and consecrated faith and current systems. He was intelligible to all, for he wrote the history of the ordinary affairs of practical and political life, and showed the application of history to trade, commerce, and mutual intercourse. As his periods are round and smooth, so is his judgment measured; and his facts are derived from those sources which he in common with all others has allowed to be such, because they have always been so regarded. He worked out his exposition according to the rule of the schools as industriously as a tradesman, a diplomatist, a lawyer, or government clerk, who knows how to avail himself of his pen; but the spark of genius was not in him, and no adventurous daring ever prompted him for a moment to overstep the once prescribed line. In him we shall therefore look in vain for that zeal to annihilate old and prevailing prejudices, and to work out a regeneration of a system in church and state already become obsolete, which animated Hume and Gibbon.

The 'History of Scotland,' under the reigns of Mary Stuart and James the Sixth, has long since become antiquated; the 'History of Charles the Fifth,' however, will always continue to be regarded as an industriously prepared, useful, instructive, historical reading-book. The 'History of America,' and the Indian

researches, belong to a kind of history of which we cannot in this place speak, because to examine and estimate its value would involve us in learned investigations. The place which Robertson occupies, and the effect of his method, which with good reason has received a high degree of extension and approbation, will perhaps be best understood, and can be made clearest at least to the few self-thinking readers, by a quotation from Gibbon's memoirs. It will be then seen that an ambitious youth, who was conscious of his own powers, never for an instant doubted of being able to reach with ease what Robertson had attained by industry, study, and thoughtful and polishing labour, whilst the deep-thinking mind and inborn genius of Hume threw him at once into a mingled feeling of delight and despair. These few words, full of important matter, are to be found in Gibbon's account of his life and studies in his memoirs.

"The old reproach, that no British altars had been raised to the muse of history, was recently disproved by the first performances of Robertson and Hume, the histories of Scotland and of the Stuarts. I will assume the presumption of saying, that I was not unworthy to read them; nor will I disguise my different feelings in the repeated perusals. The perfect composition, the nervous language, the well-turned periods of Dr. Robertson inflamed me to the ambitious hope that I might one day tread in his footsteps; the calm philosophy, the careless inimitable beauties of his friend and rival often forced me to close the volume with a mixed sensation of delight and despair*."

The difference between these two Scotchmen in their modes of viewing human life, its nature, impulses and pursuits, and in their manner of representing them, besides the difference of their natural genius and capacities, lay also in this, that Robertson spent his whole life in quiet and retirement in Scotland, and in its well-known regular and extremely orderly mode of life, and therefore remained wholly uninfluenced by the deep movements which at that time affected literature and the state, whilst Hume on the other hand was early plunged into the very midst of these commotions. The comparison of his life with his writings proves that Robertson became acquainted with mankind in Edinburgh only, and therefore polished his writings, and followed a definite plan and a prudent calculation after the man-

* Vol. 1, p. 86. Dublin, 1796.—(Trans.)

ner of historiographers royal, who ornamentally and correctly elaborate learned books for pay, orders and honours. Hume was wholly different: he was acquainted with life and the movements of the great cities and classes of men who guide the machine of state. He began his historical labours urged by his own impulse, full of inspiration for the regeneration of mankind, about which, when he became acquainted with Rousseau, he in common with him long indulged visionary fancies. Robertson wrote his history as a practical Scotchman, a mild theologian, a matter-of-fact relater; Hume as a deep-thinking, keen, investigating, sceptical philosopher.

As concerns the latter, he was not only most closely connected with the Encyclopedists in Paris, in whose *salons* he shone, as long as he lived there, but he attached himself most particularly to Rousseau, and even brought this persecuted visionary, in spite of the warnings of D'Alembert, Diderot, Morrellet and others, along with him to England, treated him there in the most friendly manner, and was very ill-rewarded for his kindness. A chief point however still remains: Hume came to his subject, not from theology, not from views of life which were liberal after the fashion of Scotland or Geneva, but in other respects altogether dull and common, not from much reading, and from books read across, through and after one another, like Gibbon or Johannes Müller, but from earnest search after truth, and the examination of prevailing opinions handed down from time immemorial, and blindly transmitted and believed from generation to generation. History with Hume was only a subordinate pursuit, only a means by which he might introduce his philosophy and his views of the state, its rule and government, in an agreeable and entertaining manner, not into the universities or among the exclusively learned, among persons who derived their prejudices from the prevailing abuses, but wholly and properly among the educated people. The resemblance of the English thinker to those men who in our days have, in like manner, used history merely as a vehicle, is in this respect only apparent.

The sophists of our time, however skilful and experienced they may be, transfer the politics of a party and the philosophy of a system, often with all their artificial terminology, into history, which in consequence ceases to be any longer an image of life and free action, but becomes fixed, is banished into the uni-

versities, and, instead of teaching humility, preaches immeasurable presumption and insolent condemnation. Hume's politics, on the contrary, were altogether human; his philosophy of life had little to do with the philosophy of the schools; it belonged to him alone, and was drawn from life.

Hume was a deep thinker; he trod a philosophical path, and travelled through the labyrinth of all the systems of speculation; and this it was, and not the lamp or the quotations, which gave value to his historical labours. He alone who has successfully tried to fathom the origin of human wisdom, the connexion of the world of fancy with the world of sense, the laws of the mental and the physical kingdoms, the resemblance of the necessity of that which the human being thinks logically right with a world regulated by eternal laws,—in a word, he alone who has sounded the nature of things and of ideas, can shed a light in time and space upon the nature, impulses and pursuits of men. Testimonies, records, sources, are without doubt indispensable; but a weak mind, even although it pretends to look down upon life, will draw from the best sources notices in the highest degree profitable and available about things of every kind; that, however, is no history. If we could here examine Hume's philosophical writings, before the public since 1733, it would be easy to show that his scepticism was on the one hand related to the philosophy of his Parisian friends, but on the other went as far beyond them as knowledge outstrips bold dogmatism, or the result of thoughtful inquiry the prattling of the saloons. The so-called French philosophers, who were too lazy and too dissipated to think for themselves, availed themselves of Hume, in the same way as they did of Pascal and Arnauld d'Andilly. This was not done by Voltaire alone, who universally appealed to Hume; but Holbach, for purposes quite different from any views which Hume entertained, even translated his treatise upon self-murder and the immortality of the soul.

As has been already remarked in the preceding volume, Hume's history could not force its way, till his philosophy, or at least some similar philosophy, had taken root in the public schools; and this first took place when those Frenchmen, who attacked the schools and institutions of the middle ages, acknowledged him for an ally, however little similarity existed between his scepticism and theirs. In the place of the tradi-

tionary and blindly received doctrines, whose worthlessness he proved, Hume did not with Rousseau set up unstable sentimentality, nor with Voltaire daring frivolity and refined sensuality; he knew and taught that there is a God within us, and that he reveals himself in our minds and in the world, though not precisely in the way which we are taught in the catechism and in sermons.

Hume was not, indeed, learned and well-grounded enough for those writers and investigators of history who judged his works from the usual point of view, because he was not only negligent in the use of the sources of history, but also superficial. They did not, however, think how important it was, even for the most industrious investigator, that such a well-grounded thinker should have so arranged the facts which were known to him, that by their arrangement they immediately give a notion of the inward connexion of divine and human things, which is sensible only to the inward eye of the profound thinker. Voltaire's example, whose history, as a history, is wholly worthless, furnishes abundant proof that the historian who cannot confidently trust his own power of mind as Hume could, will never succeed as he succeeded; the way of careful investigation remains however always the safest, because in it *something* is infallibly gained. Hume, besides, wisely addressed himself not to pedants, schoolmen, or compilers, but to the opponents of traditionary errors and abuses, to the great world, to which he also belonged, and to the thinking statesmen of every country. Wherever, therefore, a knowledge of mankind is concerned, a correct judgement of the prejudices of the middle ages, an estimate of monkish and clerical morality and of their modes of speech full of unction and flattery, are required, wherever a judgement of the past time from the standing-point of the present is desired, there he is great; he seldom thinks it advisable to remove himself into the time of which he writes; though he could certainly have done it. He was great in his own manner, and yet did not, like Voltaire, altogether sacrifice history to his philosophy. He is most unjust and most unphilosophic where the subject leads him to speak of the Puritans, of the ecclesiastical discipline in the north, and still more of those who employed legends, fables and miracles, in order, after a rude fashion, to lead rude men to yield obedience to the strict discipline of Christianity, as a means of civilization. Hume's history leads

directly to the same goal which Voltaire desired to reach by means of his; but the former knew well how to mix up so much real history therewith, that his work remained for a long time, not only in England, but in all Europe, the only source of the knowledge of English history. Hume was one of the most eminent propagators of those views of the eighteenth century which ran directly counter to all hierarchical and mechanical religion. In this respect, however, he altogether escaped the keen scent of the orthodox English incumbents, who stand too firmly by the interests of the church to allow any attack upon it whatever to escape; Gibbon, on the other hand, was vehemently and angrily attacked by them. The rage, however, of the anti-heretical Anglicans proved rather a benefit than an obstruction to Gibbon's great work, which was designed and executed wholly after the French manner.

As concerns the French design and execution of Gibbon's celebrated work, whose praise is altogether superfluous, its proof or complete representation is wholly foreign to the object of this sketch of the progress of English literature from 1760—1789, and we have only in view its relation to the Parisian philosophy, for Gibbon himself had none. Because our object is merely a matter of fact and practical representation, we borrow some notices from his letters and memoirs, from which it appears, that he, like Johannes Müller, from his childhood up, aspired at being not only a renowned but also a great man; but in his case, as well as Müller's, the necessary qualifications were wanting. They were obliged to apply themselves to rhetoric and sophistry, like heroes and conquerors to faithless politics; for they sought appearances. Unlimited vanity, thirst for reputation and renown, supported by talents and industry, can beget artists and perfect works of art; but a holy inspiration for truth and right, the simple love for a peaceful life, which history, by its description of the wild and maddening passions of the world, should nourish and maintain, retreated from them as from evil spirits. An inspiring love for eternal truth and eternal right comes through grace from above, and through this alone into the heart of the simple-minded and the humble*. In one thing, however, Hume and Gibbon fully agreed,—they were the first historians, because like Voltaire they ventured it, who threw a light upon

* “Così vuole quello, che la dà, perchè da lui si chiami.”

the life of the middle ages, not with the philosophy of the middle ages, but from the wisdom of the new period ; and they were often unjust towards the middle ages, in order to benefit their own, by bringing their strong contrasts too conspicuously into view. In this respect Gibbon, whose character and education were more French than English, went to the utmost limits : he did not, like Hume, content himself with scepticism merely ; but, relying upon his rhetoric and sophistry, he confidently ventured, whenever he found it suit his purposes, to substitute the imaginary for the real, and poetry for history. All this is manifest from the difference, much less surprising in a Frenchman than in an Englishman, between what he really was himself and actually thought and wished, and what he wished to appear, and as a great writer in truth accomplished. As Germans set exclusive value upon what they call objective representation, artistlike conception and accomplishment, it may perhaps be useful that an individual now looking at a life beyond the present, and despising the absurd pretensions of the metropolitans of civilization, should for once give their due to the subjective, to nature and its simplicity and strength, even if he should draw upon himself the appearance of being unjust toward great men. This is only in appearance ; the artist loses nothing thereby,—his work has the voice of the whole world in its favour ; and if in what follows the impression is described, which the contrast between being and appearing, between the writer and the man, has made upon an individual, it will only the more clearly show that Gibbon and Müller judged well, that conviction and truth never made a writer renowned, great and immortal in the world and with the multitude.

Hume indeed passed over from the English to the French education and manners, but he had previously made the former entirely his own. Gibbon took up his residence in Lausanne, in the neighbourhood of Voltaire, where Parisian forms alone reigned, although under a somewhat protestant modification. Enclosed in a helpless body, he had a soul which made him capable of everything to which a French rhetorician and sophist must condescend, who is obliged to follow every change of fashion, to receive and to return every impression, if he will give distinguished counsel to the great world in the politest manner. He left the University of Oxford in his seventeenth year, and became a convert to the Catholic religion on the occasion of a

journey to London in 1753, with as little consideration as he immediately afterwards laid aside the newly adopted faith like a garment. He treated the whole affair so lightly, as not to think it worth while even once to speak about it with earnestness; for what he says about his conversion to Catholicism, when applied to such a subject, is like an ill-seasoned jest. During his residence in Lausanne, he showed himself to be as light-minded in reference to an honourable attachment, and the violation of the holiest feelings of a pure and innocent soul, as he had been in the matter of religion; and this points to one and the same deficiency of this great artist in language; for what is love without religion, or religion without love? In a manner most discreditable to himself he broke off an honourable engagement with Miss Cürchod, who was at that time without property, and afterwards became the wife of the minister Necker. This cold egoism of the young man embittered the mind of Rousseau so strongly against him, that he would have no more intercourse with him.

During his residence at Lausanne, we see him less intent upon gaining true knowledge for himself, on building up his own mind on some solid foundation, and by means of study and reflection awakening and strengthening in himself the nobler feelings of humanity, than upon acquiring a premature and splendid reputation by lightly gained and imperfect knowledge and natural endowments. He had indeed already, in his nine-and-twentieth year, shown himself to be well read in and acquainted with the ancients and with antiquity; but with the true skill of a diplomatist, he immediately availed himself of the high estimation in which English travellers were held upon the continent, and of the vanity of the German, Swiss, and French literati, in order to become renowned abroad, and to extend his name and reputation amongst them. Without invitation or permission he wrote to Crevier in Paris, to Mathias Gesner in Göttingen, and to Breitinger in Zürich. He himself tells us how and on what grounds he introduced himself to Voltaire, as the latter spent the two winters of 1757 and 1758 in Lausanne, which was at that time the residence of the exclusive aristocracy of Berne. Rousseau treats him as a sophist, on account of having broken off his engagement with Miss Cürchod, wholly like a reckoning and calculating man of the world, and abuses him with a severity bordering upon injustice, because he regards him

only as an odious, egoistical Parisian philosopher, dead to every true and honourable feeling, and towards whom he felt a mortal hatred. The former general also (Helvetius), who had elevated to a system the egoism of the distinguished and the rich, must, upon the first view, have regarded him in the same light, because he immediately proffered him his friendship. When Gibbon went to Paris, Helvetius became his patron and friend, and introduced him into the well-known society of scoffers at religion which met in the house of Holbach. Gibbon had calculated his first work, composed in the time of the seven years' war, for Paris, otherwise he would scarcely have written a work in the French language, which he drew up during his abode in England, from 1759 to 1763, or have taken in England the most unnecessary trouble to recommend the study of the ancients.

He had reckoned right: his French book, and the recommendation of Lady Hervey, at once introduced him, as soon as he made his appearance in Paris, into the inmost circle of the Parisian sophists of the time. With all the ecstacy of female vanity, he wrote to his mother, how he had been received at the house of the well-known Madame Geoffrine Helvetius, and how Helvetius himself preferred him above all others. He writes to his father, that Helvetius especially had received him into his favour, and adds that he was a man equally distinguished by his heart, head, and property. He observes minutely, how much yearly income each of the Parisian Mæcenases possessed. In order fully to recognise his Parisian nature, we have only to read his memoirs, to remark how much he prefers French conversation to that of his countrymen, and how carefully he records at how many more houses he visits in Paris than in London. All this shows us that he was an artist born, that his nature was bare and empty, that he was full of art and subtilty, that reality was nothing and appearance everything.

Gibbon's supple and unlimited ambition, which, for want of practical abilities and of oratorical talents, found no satisfaction in political life, his eagerness to become distinguished in literature, and the good fortune and talent by which he accomplished his design, remind us forcibly of Johannes Müller. Both wrote apparently for the people, whom Gibbon, like Voltaire, heartily despised. Both kept an aristocratic public ever in their eye, whose views and judgement of the middle ages, as well as of Christianity, determined their own. Müller had in his eye his

Bernese and other Swiss guardians of the people, and the magnates of Vienna, Mainz, and elsewhere, with all their pride of ancestry. He had in his eye the most distinguished of the clergy, and in his Swiss history therefore he has given a poetic colouring to the whole of the middle ages and to the hierarchy, when he wrote as he did respecting the alliance of princes and about the popes. Gibbon had reason to hope for the greatest reputation, from following up his attack upon antiquated opinions, with which he had begun, and which accorded with the generally prevailing opinions in the world of fashion in Paris at the time of the publication of his work (1776), and this determined his direction and the selection of his point of view. Education, choice, the character and nature of his being, led him to French rhetoric, and experience afterwards confirmed the view, that art, and the mighty power of being able to complete by language what was wanting in strength of thought, alone gives splendour and renown upon the stage of human life, as in the theatre. He sacrificed therefore, and with justice, simplicity and nature, in order to gain a mastery in the line which he had chosen, to gain the appearance, the reputation, and the name of a great artist, which none will venture to deny him. He renounced everything, which the man who strives after truth, and not after effect, must seek more than all the ornaments of language; and, according to his character and his design, but to the great prejudice of the world, he chose, not the path which leads to the quiet approbation of the noble few, but the way to splendid renown.

Neither his mode of representation, style, nor language, is in the proper sense fully English, so far at least as regard is to be had to the expression of the old English character, although that is no reason why he should not be reckoned amongst the number of English classical writers; as Wieland, in spite of his gallicisms, is reckoned among the German. Among English writers he is the man who has best and most perfectly clothed French ease of expression and French oratory in an English dress. We would say, that his English style, and among other things his declamation, bears often the same relation to the style of the French rhetoricians, as the style of our Johannes Müller does to that of the Greek and Roman classics, insofar as the one has sacrificed the nature of English, and the other that of German style, to the imitation of what is equally foreign. Both

make every effort to equal what is foreign, only with this distinction, that Gibbon had to do with Englishmen, who will not be pleased with everything, like the Germans, and that therefore, although both alike cease to speak the language of daily life, Gibbon was not allowed to cease to be English, to be unintelligible, or to speak in a language which he himself had first created.

In historians of the eighteenth century, if it be their duty to be true to the character of their age, we cannot expect the stoicism of a Tacitus, the earnestness and severity of a Dino Compagni, the simplicity of an Herodotus, the deep and searching look into the nature of man and his relations, which distinguished Thucydides, the candour, pliancy, and touching credulity of many of the chroniclers of the middle ages. It appears to us, therefore, better and more prudent, that, like Gibbon, from the beginning, they should make no pretensions to any of these qualities, than that, like Müller, they should at once affect them all. Through calculating prudence and native genius Gibbon accomplished what is almost incredible, considering how little his soul was. As soon as he found it promoted his design, he gained the capacity and the will to struggle for knowledge and right against deception and despotism, for truth and reason against falsehood and superstition: he made, what was for him almost impossible, possible. A man, like him, who was great by art, talents, and appearance in the world, could only be great as an orator by means of the superfluities of a glowing style, and of a powerful stream of sweeping declamation, for universally, whenever he appears in life, he is mediocre and vain, and in the transactions of the world even mean and pitiable. Even his outward figure offers a strong contrast with all his pursuits. Compare the faint outline of his figure which is prefixed to his memoirs, with the circumstances of his life, and with his position in society, such as that which he courted! What a contrast exists between his restless vanity and the wanton irony which in his great work is chiefly conspicuous, when he speaks about Christianity, his ostentation of learning, whose measure and limit no man knows but he who knows how easy it is for a man to assume a learned mien, the rashness of his condemnatory judgments, his daily splendour in the light circles of the Parisians, his gallantry towards the ladies, nothing but the qualities of a trivial Frenchman,—what a contrast is there between all this

and his English figure, with the body of a hippopotamus and the face of a plum-pudding!

Gibbon was not, like Hume, a self-thinking, deep-fathoming man, who searched into the nature of things, existence and thought, but was in these respects like the French, or like the Scotchman Brougham, who has also attained this Franco-Genèvese capacity, of quickly making other people's thoughts and investigations his own, and propounding them in an admirable manner. Like the great French writers, he can take a quick and comprehensive view of various departments of knowledge, and we can therefore learn most readily through his instrumentality the results of the learned labours of the great collectors of materials upon the theology, philosophy, and jurisprudence of the times of declining antiquity, and of the rising middle ages. Because his eloquence and his great skill in representation give a charm and splendour to the thoughts which he wishes to disseminate, he has the full right of all men who are great in politics and literature to claim, that nobody should ask, whether he was really in earnest, or how his language and his conduct harmonized; we bring this point prominently forward, however, for an historical reason. We must necessarily throw the same light upon the ideal of the Doctrinaires, which, in the progress of our history, we shall let fall upon all those, who since 1789 have deceived the people by their dialectics, rhetoric, and pretended inspiration for freedom, and made them cold towards everything which is not palpable and substantial.

We no sooner, for example, see Gibbon mixing in political life, than he follows precisely the same line of conduct which all the sophists, rhetoricians, advocates, and orators who are formed after the same model, have followed from 1789 till the present day. At the very time when Gibbon, by his immortal work, knew how to gain the reputation of an apostle of the annunciation of freedom, of a zealot for the rights of reason, of an enemy of all deception, of a bitter opponent of all tyrannical and egoistical ministers and rulers, he suffered himself to be made the blind tool of one of the most detested governments, and the most hostile to freedom, of all those which, in England, governed the country in the course of the eighteenth century. The appearance of the first volume of the '*History of the Decline and Fall*,' which declaims so admirably about freedom, and generosity and greatness of soul, was contemporaneous with

the American war, and at that very time Gibbon allowed himself to be brought by a back door into parliament by the ministry, where he would willingly have remained for a longer time, silent, but voting, if he had been found any longer of use. When Lord North, at the beginning of the war, sought for votes in parliament, which came from people of renown, and which could be had for money, Lord Elliot sent Gibbon into parliament for one of his boroughs, which has now disappeared. Whether he allowed himself to slumber, as Lord North himself usually did, while his neighbours right and left, Thurlow and Wedderburne, were speaking for him, we know not; but that nature had denied him the talent of speaking, which by art, labour, and perseverance he had attained in so high a degree in writing, is plain, because he always voted faithfully with the ministry. His voice was paid for, like those of others also; he held an appointment in the Board of Trade, where he had little to do for a large salary*. The way in which he endeavours to excuse his conduct in his memoirs, is altogether unsatisfactory; in our days, indeed, we may be well excused by the example of the first and most distinguished men of learning of all monarchical states; but the true excuse, which Milton indeed calls the "tyrant's plea," necessity, is the real one; the necessity in the world, as it now is, of supporting distinguished reputation by ostentatious expenditure, because without money all honour is empty. In particular, the passage in Gibbon's memoirs in which he speaks of his parliamentary influence, may well be recommended to every distinguished literary man as a *memento mori*.

* The following rhyme was ascribed, probably without good reason, to Fox:—

King George in a fright,
Lest Gibbon should write
The story of England's disgrace,
Thought no way so sure
His pen to secure,
As to give the historian a place.

§ IV.

POLITICAL WRITERS AND SPEAKERS OF THE TIME OF THE
AMERICAN WAR.

The whole attention of the period, whose history we have related, was directed towards political writers and speakers, and we feel ourselves obliged therefore once again to refer to those men whose names have been mentioned in what has preceded, and to subjoin some particulars with respect to them, which could not with propriety be introduced into the connexion of regular historical events, without at the same time allowing ourselves to go into a characteristic notice of them, in the proper sense of the word. A judgement with regard to their speaking and style may be left to English writers; we must, however, express a strong feeling of disapprobation, at what has been said by Lord Brougham, in his ‘Statesmen of the Reign of George the Third.’ This celebrated advocate has pushed his ability to make black white, and white black, and to persuade the public that it is so, somewhat too far. He ventures to praise Lord North on account of his shameless assurance and his fluent parliamentary speaking; he dares to commend the stale and miserable wit, which he mixed up with transactions in which the weal or woe of millions was involved, and to find some marks of genius in that indifference with which he himself jested upon his own habitually returning disposition to sleep during the parliamentary debates. This indeed can surprize no one from a man like Lord Brougham, because he even praises Burke in such a strain as purposely never to allow himself to remark, that nature, a simple and correct style, brevity, conciseness, and simplicity have any value; that a good speaker should avoid far-fetched phrases, banish all bombast, and never introduce tedious learning, or wearisome and artificial knowledge, collected merely for show.

The chief point to which we must turn attention is, that the same spirit and tone which proclaimed a complete change of things in France, but which after a short time was forgotten in England, showed themselves in the writings and speeches of all the men whom we shall hereafter have occasion to mention. The tone of many English newspapers and opposition pamphlets of

this year was nothing milder than that of the 'People's Friend' of Marat or of Father Duchèsne; and the vehement speakers against the person of the king, against the ministry, and the whole court had no less knowledge, capacity, and weight with the people than Mirabeau, Barnave, and others. That all passed over without injury, almost every man ascribes to the English constitution and to the fast-seated structure of the middle ages in England; if this were the place to enter upon the subject, we should seek for the causes elsewhere.

Among the men of the people who made their power felt, by their speeches and writings against the obstinacy of king George, in the very first year of his reign, we must mention John Wilkes first, although in ability he in no respect excelled the usual journalists and pamphleteers called forth by times of political excitement. The circumstances of the times, the processes with which he was persecuted, and the same sort of events to which Marat and other wild and immoral zealots, of whose services parties avail themselves in the madness of their struggles as instruments to rouse the people, owed their ephemeral distinction, have given Wilkes also a claim to a place in history, even though both his person and writings may be regarded in themselves as altogether insignificant. Wilkes first studied in Leyden, then made a tour on the continent, was high sheriff of Buckinghamshire, (1754) and twice sat in parliament (1757 and 1761) for the borough of Aylesbury. He first deserted the party of the aristocracy, whose dissolute life he had previously shared, when his fortune was spent, and went over to the opposite party, because the other would not procure for him a profitable office. The immoral band who were then at the helm, had good reason to fear him and his bitter pen, because he had been their associate, and knew the scandalous game which, then as now, the whole of these gentlemen were accustomed to play with the religious prejudices of the people, whilst in private they made a jest of religion. The sanctity of the sabbath and the dogmas of the Anglican church were most zealously watched over and defended by the Duke of Grafton, by the Earls of Rochford and Sandwich, by Lords Weymouth, Barrington, and Thurlow, who nevertheless did not refrain from celebrating orgies, at which even the most holy things were ridiculed in the most scandalous manner.

The persecution and the outcry raised by the above-named

gentlemen of the government party, and by their associates and their hypocritical accusations against Wilkes on account of obscenity and blasphemy, embittered their former companion the more in proportion as he was acquainted with what the scandal-loving chronicles of those times report to us, about the history of their lives, which were copied from the court life of Versailles. Sir Francis Dashwood, who afterwards bore the title of Lord Le Despencer, premier baron of England, and who was chancellor of the exchequer under Lord Bute, (1762) founded a formal club consisting of twelve distinguished *roués*, for the purpose of indulging in sensualities, of which common people are ashamed. Into this club Wilkes was admitted; our pen however must not venture to write what they pursued, and the manner in which they pursued it; whoever is pleased to read such scandal, and will compare it with the French doings of the regentship and of the times of Louis the Fifteenth, may refer to Churchill's poem of the 'Candidate,' in which the filthy and blasphemous ceremonies of their inauguration are reduced into verse. These gentlemen named themselves (as we learn from a letter which Wilkes wrote in September 1762) the Franciscans, and celebrated their holy mysteries in Medenham Abbey, on the Thames.

Wilkes's 'Essay on Woman,' for which he was afterwards complained of by his associates, was only an echo in verse of what was carried on and transacted by the Franciscans in prose. Wilkes's modest poem, precisely in the same manner as Voltaire's 'Pucelle,' was for a long time the exclusive and privileged reading of the high nobility; it was esteemed altogether aristocratic and without political tendency; and it was only when Wilkes was first deserted by his aristocratic companions that he turned to the side of the people: he had alienated them by his lampoons, he won them back again by his attacks upon the hated government of England. Wilkes had readiness enough, both in writing and speaking, for a political orator in the lower sphere which he had chosen, and was rich in sarcastic humour, anecdotes, and knowledge of society. His first writing of this kind was vehement, exciting, and in some degree revolutionary. He availed himself of the prevailing hatred in England against Lord Bute as a Scotchman, against the king's mother as a German, whose connexion with Lord Bute gave great offence, and spoke about politics, as his object required, in such a way as to rouse

the passions. This occurred in a pamphlet which first appeared in 1762, under the title, 'Remarks on the Breach with Spain,' &c. He was still more vehement in his paper, the 'North Briton,' which he set up expressly in opposition to the loyal paper 'The Briton.' It may be best seen from an article in No. 45 of this journal, which laid a ground for his subsequent prosecution, that Wilkes was a demagogue of an altogether common stamp, which may be also gathered from his speeches in parliament, and the common-council of London, as well as from the addresses which he drew up or presented. All was calculated only to gain the popular voice of the moment. Wilkes's talents and his importance were quite of the same kind, and it could excite no sort of surprise that he should pass over from one extreme to the other, even if his republican friends had not made a pretext to his hand for leaving them and going over to the king. As Fox and his party, the men of the revolution, formed the so-called coalition ministry, by uniting with Lord North and his friends in the oligarchy, so might Wilkes desert them, and from 1784 onwards be loyal to the king, after he had been so long his bitter enemy.

The place next to Wilkes, as a one-sided but most distinguished political writer, is due to the author of Junius' Letters, whoever he may have been. These letters will always remain a monument of talent, on account of their style and language; they will without doubt always claim and have a place along with the philippics of Demosthenes, Cicero's Catiline orations, Lessing's fugitive sheets against the brawling Hamburg pastor, and Rousseau's letter to the Archbishop of Paris; and however strongly we may condemn the injustice, bitterness and vehemence of these letters, their strength and brevity of expression, the cutting sharpness of their short sentences, the purity and dignity of their genuine English, will long be a subject of admiration; when the muddy-flowing Scottish stream of speech which is characteristic of their censor Lord Brougham, who is a pretender to a knowledge of all subjects, and who speaks and writes about things with which he has the most flimsy acquaintance, shall have been lost in the sea of forgetfulness. As historical memoirs these letters have indeed no value; they are cutting, personal, bitter, unjust; but for awakening England from the dream of the impossibility of improving its constitution, they are of great value. The author recalled the

people to their senses, who had been lulled into slumber by the ruling families of England, which from time to time were recruited by new accessions, by means of the eternally repeated phrase of "our happy constitution," which by such repetition came at length to be regarded as a truth. He showed that the Saxon element of the constitution was continually more and more invaded by the landowners, that the Norman baronial rights were cunningly and insensibly increased, and that finally, with a view to uphold abuses, advantage had been taken, with great ingenuity, of the Byzantine laws of the emperor Justinian, which had universally prevailed since the middle ages. Lord Brougham, as well as the editor of the 'Bedford Correspondence,' which has lately been given to the public, complains bitterly of the injustice and precipitation manifested in these letters, but the letters are to be considered as speeches made on the moment and calculated for the moment. Lord Chatham, and especially Lord Mansfield, may have been each notwithstanding distinguished as a great man in his way; and if they were so, so they will remain in spite of all invectives, however the mode of action of the one or the other, as public men, may have justly exposed them at particular times to vehement reproaches, which indeed a quiet man in quiet times even by vehemence could not have made so effective, as it was necessary and possible to make them in the times of a Lord North, Grafton, Sandwich, &c. The insolence and audacity of such people can only be attacked with words like musket-balls.

In order, however, to introduce an opponent of these letters speaking in his own language, we shall quote a passage from the writings of a Scotchman bitterly exasperated against an Englishman who inveighed against the Scotch; although the annexed invective of Lord Brougham against the enemy of all Scotch industrial geniuses (we naturally think of Walter Scott) occurs to us as something apparently written in a fit of intoxication*. Without allowing ourselves to enter upon a con-

* "These things are far indeed from being unimportant. They affect essentially the question of judicial reputation; they show upon what kinds of grounds the fabric of a great man's professional fame, as well as the purity of his moral character, were assailed by the unprincipled violence of party at the instigation of their ignorance, skulking behind a signature made famous by epigrammatic language and the boldness of being venturesome in the person

futation, we might coolly reply to the advocate and ex-chancellor. These letters must, however, still at the present day be of great consideration, since he has thought it worth while, after a period of seventy years, to come forth with such vehemence as their antagonist. Besides, we have only to do with the form and with the effect of the letters, for as far as regards the contents, Lammenais' 'Words of a Believer,' and Rousseau's 'Letters from the Mountain,' are in like manner not proof against a critical examination, and still less the injurious satires of a Pietro Aretino; yet these claim and must hold their place in literature. What appears most worthy of blame in the letters is, that one perceives that a member of the English aristocracy was their author, who could not attain to a spirit of universal forbearance. In other words, we would especially censure the manifestation of strong English prejudices, that is, the inconsequence with which, on the one hand, the strongest expressions of contempt against every prejudice are uttered, and on the other, all the aristocratic prejudices of an Englishman against the Americans are exhibited. The author of the letters approves of the English on this side of the ocean raging with fire and sword against their bre-

of a printer, who gained by allowing dastardly slander to act through him with a vicarious courage."—*Brougham's Statesmen*, &c., vol. i. p. 113.

"It may surely be said with justice, that such disclosures as these, while they reduce to their true level the claims of Junius to fame, easily account for the author having died and kept his own secret. He appears to have been a person in whose bosom every fierce and malignant passion raged without the control of a sound judgment, and without any kindly feeling to attemper his nature. Writing at a time when good or even correct composition was little studied, and in the newspapers hardly ever met with, his polished style, though very far from being a correct one, and further still from good pure English, being made the vehicle of abuse, sarcasm and pointed invective, naturally excited a degree of attention which was further maintained by the boldness of his proceedings. No man can read a page of any letter without perceiving that the writer has but one way of handling every subject, that he constructs his sentences with the sole design of saying the most bitter things he can in the most striking way, without ever regarding in the least degree their being applicable or inapplicable to the object of the attack. The consequence is, that the greater part of his invective will suit one bad man or wicked minister as well as another. It is highly probable, that whoever he might be, he had often attacked those with whom he lived on intimate terms or to whom he was under obligations. This affords an additional reason for his dying unrevealed. That he was neither Lord Ashburton nor any other lawyer is proved by what we have said of his gross ignorance of law. To hold that he was Mr. Francis is libelling that gentleman's memory; and although much external evidence concurs in pointing towards him, he certainly never wrote anything of the same kind in his own character."—*Brougham's Statesmen*, &c., vol. i. p. 115, 116.

thren on the other side, in order to retain them under their dominion and to tax them, and like a savage beast attacks Lord Chatham, whom he had previously repeated and often praised, as soon as his lordship shows himself favourable to the Americans.

As one-sided as the author of Junius himself, and almost as vehement, Edmund Burke first made himself renowned as a zealous defender of freedom. His style is the very opposite of that of Junius' Letters. He employs a bombast in favour of freedom, which reminds us of our mystical religious politicians, in order afterwards like them to use the same bombast in the defence of servility and superstition. Burke's style is as exuberant, his speech as soaring in metaphors and poetic redundancy, his language as glowing and figurative, as the language of Junius is chaste and severe, definite, correct, solid, and wonderfully in accordance with grammatical and etymological laws. Burke immediately showed himself to be a declaimer, but no one imagined that he, who on his first appearance went hand in hand with Fox, the English Mirabeau, and who with vehemence defended and promulgated democratical principles, would afterwards rage like a demoniac against his own former friends and principles; and yet Burke afterwards took under his protection all the abuses of the old French monarchy, the privileges of the nobility, tithes and the fanatical dominion of the clergy, and in his defamatory book* ('Reflections on the French Revolution,') he appealed, in the style of Peter the Hermit, to all princes to make a crusade against the French nation.

As other Irishmen seek their fortune by the sword, Burke sought his by his pen, and wrote at first under an assumed name upon morals. His work upon 'the Sublime and Beautiful,' which appeared in 1757, made him afterwards be regarded as a renowned writer on taste. Of this treatise we may just remark in passing, that it is yet much read in England in our century, and that in the beginning of this century a new translation of it was well received in France. Rockingham therefore resolved, with good reason, to bring its renowned author into parliament, as the representative of his interest in the House of Commons. Burke was accordingly returned for one of his bo-

* 'Reflections on the Revolution in France, and on the proceedings in certain societies in London relative to that event' (1790).

roughs in 1765, and wrote at that time, as the defender of freedom and the rights of the people, the best political writings which we have from his pen. Toward the end of the time fixed for this parliament, he came out with a speech on the occasion of the Boston Port Bill, which gained him celebrity in America as well as in Europe. In the following parliament (which first met in 1775) he reached the summit of his fame, which he himself afterwards curtailed in order to obtain the favour of the privileged and the unimproveable. The writing which we have above pointed out as his best appeared in the year 1770 under the title of 'Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontent.' Burke, as Rockingham's creature, although in other respects attentive to what is solid, practical and substantial, becomes here a theoretic democrat, and falls almost into the same tone with Wilkes and with Junius' Letters. This treatise, which is to be found in the second volume of his works, retains in consequence a very remarkable importance, as a key to the knowledge of the origin and to the manner of the first propagation of that democratical notion, which Burke, as soon after as 1790, so vehemently reviled, and the blame of whose invention and propagation he gave wholly to the French. It appears from his own writings, that these principles came from England to the continent gratis, as opium was sent to China for money; and the people of the continental states were afterwards reviled on account of these notions by the islanders in the same way as the Chinese at present are, because they desire and buy the opium with which they are poisoned. In order to prove this, we borrow from Lord Brougham the account of three passages of the treatise which are particularly striking, and which without this indication would probably not have fallen immediately under our eye.

In one of them, this client of one of the aristocratic families, who, in order to be sure of him, at their cost provided economically for his housekeeping, says expressly, that he is properly no friend of the oligarchy and of their families, who have made themselves masters of England. "If it were not a bad habit to moot cases on the supposed ruin of the constitution, I should be free to declare that, if it must perish, I would rather by far see it resolved into any other form than lost in that austere and insolent domination."

In another place he uses completely the language of the Gironde, or of the moderate men of the Mountain. When (he again remarks,) discontent has so far gained the upper hand among a people, then we may believe that the blame is always to be attributed to the conduct of the government.

“ I am not one of those who think that the people are never in the wrong; they have been so frequently and outrageously, both in other countries and in this. But I do say, that in all disputes between them and their rulers, the presumption is at least upon a par in favour of the people. The people have no interest in disorder: when they do wrong, it is their error and not their crime. But with the governing part of the state it is far otherwise.”

In this paper also, a regeneration of the nation, such as was called for in France in 1789, is as little the question as in the Letters of Junius, and yet Burke calls out:—“ I see no other way for the preservation of a decent attention to public interest in the representatives, but the interposition of *the body of the people itself*, wherever it shall appear, by some flagrant and notorious act, by some capital innovation, that these representatives are going to overleap the fences of the law and to introduce arbitrary power.”

As an orator, Burke appeared for the first time on an occasion very favourable to his reputation, with a long speech, elaborated like a book. This was in March and April, 1774, at the time when Lord Chatham caused himself to be carried to parliament, and delivered in the Upper House that remarkable speech, whose truly eloquent conclusion we shall presently give in a note, and especially because it is a specimen of a quite different sort of eloquence from that which is to be found in Burke's speeches, which were carefully studied and calculated for effect, and therefore overloaded with tropes and metaphors, and spoken with a wearying tediousness.* Burke, indeed, did not venture

* “ My Lords, it has always been my fixed and unalterable opinion, and I will carry it with me to the grave, that this country had no right under heaven to tax America. It is contrary to all the principles of justice and civil policy; it is contrary to that essential unalterable right in nature engrafted into the British Constitution as a fundamental law, that what a man has honestly acquired is absolutely his own, which he may freely give, but which cannot be taken from him without his consent. Pass then, my Lords, instead of those harsh and severe edicts, an amnesty over their errors; by measures of lenity and affection allure them to their duty; act the part of a generous and forgiving parent. A period may arrive, when this parent may stand in need of

to go so far as a great number of learned men among us have ventured to go, in the bombast of an apparently philosophical mishmash of all sorts of knowledge, of far-fetched images, allusions, metaphors, artistical expressions, of confusing and confused poetical scraps. But he also showed, and that too often in his speeches, more acquaintance with subjects of various kinds and of learned knowledge, than of criticism, strength of judgement, in a word than, of that tact which strikes the right point at a single stroke. It is no wonder therefore, that after 1789, he fell headlong into the abyss of bad taste and of madness, when he directed the same bombast and raving fury against those principles, whose defence had obtained for him the renown of a great orator, in the case of the Americans.

Besides, as to what concerns Burke's style and language, since Lord Brougham indefinitely and without any fixed principle, as he is used to do, has pronounced a judgement upon them, we might refer to him, who ought to understand that; but we regard it as the highest degree of bad taste in Burke, when speaking of Wilkes being chaired by the people, to compare it to Pindar's soaring above the clouds. His periods are brilliant, but endless, and he himself afterwards rendered his pathos and gesticulation ridiculous; in his declamation against the Jacobins, upon mentioning the word, he suddenly drew forth the dagger which he had expressly brought with him to be the quaver of his bravura against the Jacobins. We shall however leave undetermined how much of his eagerly sought and far-fetched images, of his epigrams, of his theatrically calculated expressions of assumed passion was necessary for the effect of his rhetoric, and shall proceed to speak of his continually increasing republican vehemence.

In a speech delivered on the 19th of April, 1774, in support of Rose Fuller's motion* wholly to abolish the duty upon tea, Burke expressed himself against this small tax, which the government wished to retain, with much less warmth than Lord

every assistance she can receive from a grateful and affectionate offspring. The welfare of this country, my Lords, has ever been my greatest joy, and under all the vicissitudes of my life has afforded me the most pleasing consolation. Should the all-disposing hand of Providence prevent me from contributing my poor and feeble aid in the day of her distress, my prayer shall ever be for her prosperity. 'Length of days be in her right hand, and in her left hand riches and honour! May her ways be ways of pleasantness, and all her paths be peace!'"

* 19th of April, 1774. See Burke's Works, vol. ii, p. 349.

Chatham in the Upper House, and his remarks upon persons, clearly show him to have been Rockingham's humble client and appointed advocate. In reference to the tax he says,—“ The tax must be given up, for on what principle does it stand? This famous revenue stands at this hour on all the debate as a description of revenue, not as yet known in all the comprehensive (but too comprehensive) vocabulary of finance,—a preamble tax. It is indeed a tax of sophistry, a tax of pedantry, a tax of disputation, a tax of war and rebellion, a tax for anything but benefit to the imposers or satisfaction to the subject.” So much for the subject; as to what respects the persons, in this speech Grenville, who had first introduced the tax, is spoken of as a great man in the country, which scarcely any man except Burke would have said. He describes him as bred up to the law, as suffering somewhat from the illiberality of mind which the profession superinduces, and as a man early plunged into the turmoil of business; but the horse-jockey Rockingham was the true man who wished to see the tax abolished. The following studied explosion may serve as a specimen of his style:—“ It was in the midst of this chaos of plots and counterplots, it was in the midst of this complicated warfare against public opposition and private treachery, that the firmness of that noble person was put to the proof. He never stirred from his ground, no not an inch: he remained fixed and determined in principle, in measure, and in conduct; he secured no retreat, he sought no apology.” Beside this man, of whom, if one would believe Burke, Horace had formerly prophesied “ *fractus si illabitur orbis*,” &c. Lord Chatham appeared with bowed head. He is blamed because he had formed an unpopular cabinet, and because he had prescribed plans, of whose disadvantageous operation for all following times Burke expresses himself as apprehensive.

Burke already appears very different in his second elaborated and renowned speech on North American affairs, delivered on the 15th of November, 1775, and in his letter to the sheriffs of Bristol on the affairs of America, written in 1777. We shall extract a short passage from this letter, in order to prove that as early as this time Burke, supported by the noble eloquence of the elder Pitt, propounded principles in parliament, and through parliament to the whole of Europe, as the emanations of pure wisdom, which he afterwards repudiated, and represented as folly

and as a modern French invention, and which were persecuted through his whole life by the younger Pitt. This doctrine is nothing else than the theory of the progressive improvement of states and of constitutions. "These were the considerations, gentlemen, which led me early to think, that in the comprehensive dominion which the Divine Providence had put into our hands, instead of troubling our understandings with speculations concerning the unity of empire and the identity or distinction of legislative powers, and inflaming our passions with the heat and pride of controversy, it was our duty in all soberness to conform our government to the character and circumstances of the several people who composed this mighty and strangely diversified mass. I never was wild enough to conceive that one method would serve for the whole. I was persuaded that government is a practical thing, made for the happiness of mankind, and not to furnish out a spectacle of uniformity, to gratify the schemes of visionary politicians. Our business was to rule, not to wrangle; and it would have been a poor compensation that we had triumphed in a dispute, while we lost an empire."*

Fox first appeared as a great speaker in the same cause, but with greater modesty, relying altogether on his inborn genius, and on the study of the ancient classics, whose simple and pure taste guarded him from all vain bombast and foolish display of knowledge of all kinds, of extensive reading, ample quotation, and various learning. With such power as to carry all before him, he attacked the corruption of those people, who to this day govern England according to the principles and prejudices which have been handed down to them, to whose caste he himself belonged, and in whose corruptions, alas! with all his greatness of genius and nobleness of heart, he too much participated. Fox may be compared with Mirabeau in every point of view; he left no back door open for himself, as is generally done, but broke irreconcilably not only with the pedantic king and his ministers, but with king and monarchy in general, or with the monarchical system. He spoke out with complete revolutionary vehemence. In dress he first affected the simplicity of Franklin, and then jacobinical cynicism; he wore the American colours, and at the time of the rebellion in London in 1780, caused by the foolish Lord George Gordon, he,

* Burke's Works, vol. iii. London: 1815.

as well as Wilkes, was active for the restoration of peace. Fox was accused of having played the same character in the days on which a part of the metropolis was desolated by murder and arson, which Mirabeau, as his enemies alleged, in October, 1789, played in the murder scenes at Versailles.

In order to learn to distinguish what relation natural eloquence and a style formed after the model of the ancients, chaste, forcible and pure, bears to bombast and to a tasteless and artificial style, which charms the multitude, and which has now found a reception into the almost too intelligible correct French literature, under the name of the romantic—the speeches of Burke and Fox should be compared. In the former there is wearisome tediousness, fanciful soaring, tasteless metaphors, overloaded and often ridiculous images, as amongst our German bombast writers, a mixing together of all languages and technical expressions, allusions to all the sciences from the integral calculus and metaphysics to navigation; in the other, English, like our Lessing's German, grammatical, strong and intelligible, which with one word calls forth many ideas.

In the following portions of this work we shall have occasion to speak so much of Fox in the political history, that we can here refer only to his first speech, and to the effect which this speech must have made upon the Continent, which was at that time wholly enslaved. At present we shall take no notice of Sheridan, who spoke in the same strain. In his first speech, on the 20th of February, 1776, Fox shows himself in the English parliament as Mirabeau afterwards exhibited himself, in May, 1789, in the French National Assembly. From this time forward, his speeches became uniformly more vehement in expression and more perfect in form. These speeches, circulated by the newspapers, were formal manifestos against monarchy and in favour of republicanism. In his very first address, the young man speaks with great decision against the king and his ministers, and urgently presses Parliament to seize upon a part of the government. It was proposed in Parliament to appoint a committee of inquiry, on account of the bad success of the war which had been begun in America. In a vehement speech pronounced in favour of this motion, Fox says expressly, "It may be proved by the clearest and most indubitable proofs, that the ultimate design of the government is the complete overthrow of the existing constitution."

In addition to Jefferson's introduction to the declaration of American independence, and to the speeches in the English Parliament, we must mention some other writers who had a great influence upon the public voice in England and in America, in reference to the growing disinclination in Europe against the absolutism of princes and ministers, and the inclination towards republican institutions. Among these we must first speak of the works of two political writers of the time, which were very extensively circulated in America, and became the foundation of the principles of the present so-called Radicalism in England. These writers are Dr. Price, the Lamennais of his time, and Thomas Payne, who gained great merit by the service which he rendered to the North American republic, and afterwards had a seat in the French National Convention. These two men were indeed wholly different in character; the one was mild and gentle, the other warm and violent; both were equally zealous for democracy and civil freedom.

Price, as well as Payne, remained true to his principles, which is very rarely the case with radical writers, even when their circumstances are most favourable. Both stood by Burke in the American war, and were as zealous for the American cause as he; both were afterwards passionately assailed by him, when he raved in favour of things as they are. This is particularly remarkable for this reason, that in 1790 Payne and Burke stood at the opposite extremes: the former preached anarchy and the disowning of Christianity, the latter raved for feudalism and the established church. Payne and Price were greeted in the most friendly manner in England by the sly Franklin, as useful allies of his fellow-countrymen, and even invited by him to go to America, where at that time he and John Adams wished to create some sort of popular literature in favour of democracy by means of newspapers, pamphlets and magazines. Payne accepted the invitation; Price remained on this side the ocean, and, notwithstanding his somewhat revolutionary political opinions, was highly esteemed in England and Scotland as a preacher and literary man, as a political economist and statist.

Price, who in the course of his life published at least fifteen different and extensively read works, began with moral treatises and sermons, and with such also he closed his career as a writer. About the middle of the period of his literary activity, when a member of the Royal Society, he wrote on Tontines, National

Debt, and many other political and statistical subjects, which do not belong to our present inquiry; we mention him here only because he wrote two vehement attacks upon the English constitution, which had been idolized by Montesquieu, and exalted to a paragon of perfection by that part of the English who prospered under its rule, and who alone in their lives, as well as in their writing, could well raise their voices in its favour. About the time at which Fox made his first speech, Price wrote his ‘Observations on the Justice and Policy of the War with America,’ in which, with just precision, he hits the corrupt spot of the English constitution and of the aristocracy. On account of this treatise, by a unanimous vote of the Common Council of London he received the thanks of the citizens, and was presented with the freedom of the city in a gold box. A judgement can be readily formed from the following passage, of the manner in which he makes the cause of America the cause of the people:—“Freemen are not to be governed by force, or dragooned into compliance. If capable of bearing to be so treated, it is a disgrace to be connected with them. The attempt to subjugate them by confiscating their effects, burning their towns, or ravaging their territories, is a wanton exertion of cruel ambition, which, however common it has been among mankind, deserves to be called by harder names than I choose to apply to it. Suppose such an attempt was to succeed; would it not be a fatal preparation for subduing yourselves? Would not the disposal of American places, and the distribution of an American revenue, render that influence of the crown irresistible which has already stabbed your liberties? Turn your eyes to India; there more has been done than is now attempted in America; there Englishmen, actuated by the love of plunder and the spirit of conquest, have depopulated whole kingdoms, and ruined millions of innocent people by the most infamous oppression and rapacity. The justice of the nation has slept over these enormities. Will the justice of Heaven sleep? Are we not now execrated on both sides of the globe?”

The first attack appeared in 1775; two years after came a second, which excited still greater attention, because with a terrible logical precision, and with an irresistible power of speech, he attacked the principles of all constitutions, consisting on the one hand of privileges gradually usurped and arbitrarily distributed, and on the other of weakness and neglect; and with rational arguments supported by experience he shattered to

fragments the positive rights of parchments and seals and of the hierarchy and aristocracy founded upon them. This treatise was his 'Additional Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty.' Its contents will be readily understood from the general indication which has been given. The work was received with shouts of triumph and joy by the one party in England, and was naturally assailed with fury by the other, whose shibboleth was 'Church and King.' These saw with great regret any animadversions upon a constitution which in its working was so advantageous to a great number of families. And to us indeed, the good Dr. Price appears to dream a little too philanthropically, when he applies the wisdom of the republic of Plato to the dregs of Romulus. Price did right not to seek for his model of a republic in North America, as Franklin advised him. Thomas Payne did so because he was enjoying acquisitions which he gained there. The defenders of the American principles, to which Payne remained true to his end, were not so firm as he was; those advocates would rather have enjoyed their aristocratic reputation gained by means of democracy, in a state less fluctuating and less dependent on the humours of the people. This is proved by the example of John Adams, who, after he had been first ambassador in London on behalf of the Union, and at its cost, then vice-president and president of the new republic, like a thousand other advocates and juristical sophists who have become distinguished, bore witness in favour of Burke against Price.

Thomas Payne, before he settled in America, was intimate with the author of the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' at a time when the latter was in bad circumstances: in America he first established his reputation as a republican writer, and at the same time gained no inconsiderable property. Being recommended by Franklin to his friends, in order to bring the English government into contempt and hatred, he first wrote some articles in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*. In these articles, of which single ones were afterwards circulated, the nature of the English egoistical government was laid open, in a cutting style, and it was shown that, to all the evils of the hierarchy and aristocracy, there was yet to be added the evil consequences of monarchical obstinacy. The horrors, oppressions, and inhumanity which had been shortly before practised in India, and the admiration which at that time in England was lavished upon

Clive as a conqueror and a hero, afforded him a suitable opportunity of explaining by examples the text of the Latin poet with respect to crimes called forth by the thirst for gold ("auri sacra fames"). The English opposition, which drove Clive to commit self-murder, raised their voices with the same energy as Payne against the English patriotism of a Clive, which was so destructive to India, as well as against admiration of a greatness, whether military, mercantile, or æsthetic, which outrages every feeling of humanity, and trumpets forth murder and robbery as deeds of heroism. In Payne's *Considerations upon the English rule in India*, the completely unrecognized points of natural rights and of natural morality were particularly brought forward. These considerations, as well as those upon Clive and his tragical death, excited great attention on both sides of the Atlantic, because Payne seized upon and held fast by the purely human, and not the diplomatic, mercantile, and military point of view. That this treatise, like all the rest, contained much that was one-sided and unreasonably vehement, lies in the nature of political writings, and need not here be detailed.

The other treatises which Payne wrote at that time, in order to promote the interests of the Americans, more or less resembled these articles; they were the forerunners of his chief work, which was to instruct the Americans on the rights of man, and which was sent forth previous to their declaration of independence. This was the treatise which he entitled '*Plain Common Sense*,' in which he used the Old Testament and a belief in revelation (to which in other respects he attached no importance) for the promotion of his revolutionary views. The book excited at that time almost the same attention as '*Die Worte eines Gläubigen*,' (the words of a believer,) has done in our days, and its political tendencies were about the same. Its style, imagery, language, roused all the feelings of the people, and set every passion in commotion. On every occasion he avails himself so skilfully of the old faith, he profits so admirably by the anti-popish feeling of the New Englanders, that one is inclined to do him the honour of believing that Franklin had lent him his aid in this defence of the democratic republican system against the English principles. Payne exhibited monarchy, according to the Bible, as a sort of popery, into which the Israelitish democracy had degenerated against the will of God. On these points also he could boldly appeal to Milton and the pious

republicans by whom Penn's colony was founded. In this way, supported by the Bible, Payne not only turned hereditary succession into ridicule, but he had recourse for help to the books of Samuel, in order to prove from the Scriptures that the Israelites were foolish, and by the command of God were rebuked by their high-priests, because, instead of preserving the republican constitution given them by God, they asked for a king, and compelled the high-priest to anoint him. By these means he took occasion to show to his believing readers what heavy penalties, inflicted by the oppression of those kings, the Israelites were obliged to endure, and how they repented and atoned for the sins which they had committed in lusting after a king, and in opposing themselves to that democracy given them by God.

The fifteen pamphlets which appeared one after another (under the title of the 'Crisis,') during the war, from 1776 to 1783, were all conceived in the same spirit; they formed a sort of periodical, and were probably not less useful to the American cause than a small body of auxiliary troops would have been. Payne was therefore in all respects fitted to set up a banner of union for the opponents of the prevailing system in Europe, and to combat rage with rage and madness with madness, when Burke took the field in defence of priest and noble with the standard of intolerance. We shall hereafter have occasion to speak of the character which Payne played in the French revolution, and of his treatise upon the 'Rights of Man,' which he raised as the banner of infidelity, in opposition to Burke's standard of faith: we shall only remark here, that Labaume, in 1793, published in French the treatise first mentioned ('Common Sense,') at the time in which Payne was chosen a member of the Convention. In relation to his appearance at the times of terror, we cannot overlook the fact, that his connexion with the men who played the chief characters in the French revolution, and with Paris in general, originated in the time of the American revolution. The Congress had sent him to Paris, to support Franklin in the transactions connected with the loan which the Americans hoped to receive from the French government, or to raise in Holland upon their credit. In this he was fortunate, and, notwithstanding his somewhat plebeian origin and inclinations, he played his character well, in those wholly monarchical times, and in the splendid monarchical and academical circles of Paris.

Along with these political writers born in England, we must

also mention in this literary department the name of the American Franklin, on account of his long residence in Europe, and of the European importance of his name. He is the more remarkable and distinguished, from having preserved himself wholly free from the vanity and other common faults of democracy, because even Rousseau, without knowing or suspecting it, was made unhappy his whole life through by his Genevese nature, and the vanity which clung to him, of which he was himself unconscious. Franklin's whole life was a school of democracy, and the best which it furnishes, because he first learned to labour and to depend for success upon his own exertion, and then to rule himself, before he appeared as a political reformer. His writings are quite in character with his life ; he is therefore a profitable, useful, a prudent and intelligent writer, but by no means a great one. It would lead us too far to go into what is said of Franklin by Sparks, in his recently published work in ten volumes ; we satisfy ourselves by pointing out his participation in the work of awakening the constitutional spirit in Europe, by some hints in reference to his diplomatic and literary activity.

We can embrace these points the more briefly, because a French writer has recently given some very useful hints* with respect to Franklin's diplomatic activity, drawn from his letters published by Sparks. He shows that Franklin was by nature a diplomatic genius ; but we must add to this, that he combined an earnest zeal for human well-being, and a mild, gentle, intelligent religion, with his just and practical tact, and with the cold and calculating prudence of a diplomatist. As he himself informs us, he had been too well acquainted with the evil ways and errors of sensuality ; in early youth he improvidently wasted money, which was necessary to his success ; he broke a promise of marriage, and plunged his betrothed into great misery, although she afterwards became his wife : when he gave up these follies, and turned to a regular course of life, he taught, by precept and example, that the path of strict order and justice is the only path which can lead a citizen to true independence in this world, and to the hope of happiness in a future state.

The prudent Franklin therefore, from the very beginning, left the violent and destructive part of democratic exciting instrumentality to others, and only quietly aided them afterwards. Publicly, Franklin was an advocate of peace in England, as well

* *Revue des deux Mondes*, June 1841.

as in America, but secretly he had long before plotted and prepared the separation of the colonies from the mother country, and was not in the least degree deceived or intoxicated by the honours which were heaped upon him by the idolatry and fashionable devotion which were offered to him, or induced to lay a whit more value upon the admiration of people of the world than it deserved, although he made a masterly use of that which people name "the rage" for those who are in fashion.

As a democratic writer he worked for fourteen years, more practically than theoretically, more morally and industriously than, properly speaking, politically. As a diplomatist, under the exterior of a child of nature, he was the slyest and coolest calculating statesman, and his calculating prudence extended even to his dress. At a time when in England, in large parties, every man appeared in a ridiculous court dress with gold lace, and all that belongs to such a style, Franklin from the first presented himself in the simple dress of a citizen of the times of William Penn; still, however, he wore a peruke. He first threw the peruke also away, when his political plans were matured, when he saw from the writings of the French, and also from the newspapers, how much his diplomatic influence was increased among the fashionable world with whom he had to do, by his citizen's dress, his high shoes made of strong leather, and the kind of buckles which he wore. He renounced the peruke, and in fact, as he appeared among the French courtiers, his simple gray hair seems to have had a much greater effect than the broad ribbon of some ancient order. Monarchical France thronged around to see democracy in a democrat, and to contemplate in reality the man whose image was painted in Rousseau's novels. The fashionable young gentlemen, in their inspiration for freedom, looked with pleasure and with malicious satisfaction upon a son of nature in the throng of courtiers, in the pomp of the court at Versailles, which resembled a masquerade.

Franklin began his course as a writer with a little book, in which he taught the way by which a poor man may become rich and a humble man distinguished, without disturbing the order of society. Morality, order, propriety, were to be promoted by 'Richard Saunders' Almanack,' which he began in 1772, at the same time as he distinguished himself as an experimental and practical natural philosopher (for Franklin was no mathematician or chemist), and this end the book fully

attained. This almanack of North American economical and trading wisdom circulated to the extent of ten thousand copies for five-and-twenty years, under the title of ‘Poor Richard’s Almanack,’ made him rich, and, by means of proverbial phrases introduced between the remarkable days, that portion of the people wise, who read nothing else than the calendar*. The nature of the wisdom so taught may be seen from the papers in Franklin’s writings which are superscribed ‘The Way to Wealth.’ The last of the almanacks was circulated under the above-mentioned title as his own book, and, united with a similar work, the ‘Proverbs of Old Henry,’ won all hearts to the democrat, at a time in which sentimentality and philanthropy were the fashion. The ‘Proverbs of Old Henry,’ as well as ‘Poor Richard’s Maxims,’ had precisely the same sort of influence upon a large circle which Pestalozzi’s first part of ‘Leonhard and Gertrude’ had upon a smaller one in Germany and Switzerland.

Franklin’s writings upon natural philosophy do not fall within the scope of our design, but we must shortly notice his course as a statesman and diplomatist, in order to complete something, which has only been slightly touched upon in the political history. From 1747 he had been a member of the Assembly of Deputies of Pennsylvania, before he entered upon his career as a diplomatist in 1757, to which he was so admirably fitted by nature. He was first agent in London for Pennsylvania, then for Massachusetts, Georgia and Maryland. In spite of his republican notions of the aristocracy, and of the strict clerical corporations of the universities, he appeared to be a man of such importance, that the universities bestowed their honours upon him, who had become a celebrated literary man without the formality of a learned university education, the study of the ancients, or the higher mathematics. The universities of St. Andrew and Glasgow in Scotland, and of Oxford in England, elected him as an honorary member of their respective bodies, and that of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws. On the occasion of his second mission to England, in 1764, he was allowed to appear before the bar of parliament†, because he was on good terms at the same time with some members of the ministry of that day and with the opposition. We have elsewhere

* Vol. v. p. 110. London, 1819.

† See his Examination, Appendix No. 4, 2 vol. Works. London, 1819.—*Trans.*

already remarked, that his declarations in parliament were oracular. They were applicable, subtly conceived, and benevolent; and the instruction which he incidentally communicated with respect to the notions of right, constitution, and government, which were cherished in his native country, being circulated by means of the newspapers and in other writings, formed an abridgement of the principles of a new theory of political rights, wholly opposed to that which prevailed among the old states of Europe. The impression which Franklin's appearance before the bar of the House made was so much the greater, as for the moment parliament and the government listened to the counsel of the prudent American.

From this time forth Franklin became active as a diplomatist, in which character the union of the situation of an English official with that of the agent of provinces striving for independence was somewhat enigmatical. Before parliament, in articles in magazines, in pamphlets, he therefore always appears as the counsellor of peace, of moderation and mildness; his private letters to his American friends were quite of a different tenor. In these, and in the observations with which Samuel Adams put them into circulation, the rights of the Americans were brought prominently forward by means of an admirably skilful use of parliamentary debates; and by arguments adapted to the nature of their life, the Americans were made to see that they could save much money and gain more, if they broke with the mother-country. At this time also he got possession, in a somewhat equivocal manner, of four private letters of Hutchinson* the governor, and of Oliver the deputy-governor of Massachusetts, which being printed in 1773, were thrown as torches into the already existing mass of burning materials. Notwithstanding Franklin always spoke in England of reconciliation, yet in one of his private letters, distributed as circulars by Samuel Adams, under the most loyal, mildest and humblest phrases, he conceals the advice to revolt, in a manner worthy of this most cunning statesman, which revolt he immediately foretells. One passage may serve as an example.

“ To Mr. Winthrop.

“ Boston, July 25, 1773.

“ DEAR SIR,—I am glad to see that you are elected into the

** Works, vol. ii. p. 385, &c.*

council, and are about to take part in our public affairs. Your abilities, integrity, and sober attachment to the liberties of our country, will be of great use in this tempestuous time, in conducting our little bark into safe harbour. By the Boston newspapers, there seems to be among us some violent spirits, who are for an immediate rupture. But I trust the general prudence of our countrymen will see that, by our growing strength, we advance fast to a situation in which our claims must be allowed; that by a premature struggle we may be crippled and kept down another age; that as between friends every affront is not worth a duel, between nations every injury is not worth a war, so between the governed and governing every mistake in government, every encroachment on right, is not worth a rebellion. It is in my opinion sufficient for the present, that we hold them forth on all occasions, not giving up any of them, using at the same time every means to make them generally understood and valued by the people; cultivating a harmony among the colonies, that their union in the same sentiments may give them the greater weight; remembering withal, that this protestant country (our mother, though lately an unkind one,) is worth preserving, and that her weight in the scale of Europe and her safety in a great degree may depend on our union with her. Thus conducting ourselves, I am confident we may in a few years obtain every allowance of, and every security for, our inestimable privileges, that we can wish or desire *."

In the following year the vehemence of the celebrated English lawyer Wedderburne (afterwards Lord Loughborough) gave him an opportunity of rousing the indignation of the whole of Europe against the insolence of the English, by opposing quietness, restraint, and self-possession, to the rudeness and injurious speeches of the solicitor-general, and to his blustering and swaggering about positive rights, the right of nature and the principles of justice. In the farce of a trial which the English government thought it advisable, in January 1774, to bring before the privy council, Wedderburne had the imprudence to make the cause of Massachussetts and of the other provinces popular, and to recommend them to the friends of humanity, by accusing the universally beloved philanthropist and admired Franklin of being the cause of all the disquiet. The paper which Franklin presented

* Vol. iii. p. 381. London, 1819.

was mild; his complaints, as agent of the province, against the governor and deputy-governor were modestly brought forward, without any pretensions to the eloquence of a mere advocate; and it is therefore the more surprising, that the solicitor-general, who was defending the accused before the privy council, should have thus poured out a torrent of abuse upon the American patriot who was admired by the whole world. We shall quote a passage of the speech in a note, as an example and proof of that English superciliousness which is praised by Englishmen as a model of oratorical vehemence and of eloquence, and which gave so much pleasure to a numerous auditory of a certain class, that they broke out into a loud shout of triumph and threw up their hats even in the very court itself, rejoicing over the orator of old England.

The victory, if not in the privy council, at least in the eyes of all Europe, remained with the slyness and moderation of the American agent, who at this time was all in favour of peace, of mild and friendly proceedings, although Wedderburne was not altogether wrong in declaring the quiet-working Franklin to be the originator and founder of the whole quarrel, though he made the accusation with far too much rudeness and personality*. When Wedderburne descends so far as to accuse Franklin of hearsays which had no connexion whatever with the question in hand, viz. that, by purloining and making public private letters, he had given occasion to enmities and duels,

* "Dr. Franklin stands in the light of prime mover and first conductor of this whole contrivance against his Majesty's two governors; and having by the help of his own special confidants and party leaders, first made the Assembly his agent in carrying on his own secret designs, he now appears before your Lordships to give the finishing stroke to the work of his own hands. How these letters came into the possession of any one but the right owners is a mystery for Dr. Franklin to explain. Your Lordships know the train of mischiefs which followed this concealment. After they had been left for five months, to have their full operation, at length comes out a letter, which it is impossible to read without horror, expressive of the coolest and most deliberate malevolence. My Lords, what poetic fiction only had penned for the breast of a cruel African, Dr. Franklin has realized and transcribed from his own. His, too, is the language of Zanga:—

'Know then, 'twas I!

I forged the letter, I disposed the picture;

I hated, I despised, and I destroy!' "

And he now appears before your Lordships, wrapped up in impenetrable secrecy, to support a charge against his Majesty's governor, and expects that your Lordships should advise the punishing them on account of certain letters, which he will not produce, and which he does not tell how he obtained. These are the lessons taught in Dr. Franklin's school of politics." &c.

Franklin only laments that the privy council, in a case of such great importance, should expose themselves to disgrace by their participation in such feelings*. He must nevertheless have been deeply stung by the reproach, for he said, "he should regard himself as something still worse than he had been described, if any thing which came out of such a mouth could affect him." This is quite as bitter as what the solicitor-general had just said, and can only be exceeded by the anecdote, if indeed it be true, related by Lord Brougham, which showed the future chancellor and his king to have been detestable egoists. "Lord Loughborough," says Lord Brougham, "had always devoted himself with servility to King George the Third, even in the present century, and it would appear that the King had no better friend than Lord Loughborough; but when his death was suddenly announced to him, he is said to have coldly replied, 'Then he has not left a worse man behind him†.'" We are not disposed, however, to allow the anecdote an historical value upon the authority of Lord Brougham.

Franklin's diplomatic and watchful observation is not to be mistaken in the whole progress of the so-called American revolution. When every means had been first tried to obtain justice according to the old European principles of national law, and every attempt had been contemptuously repulsed, an entirely new right and a new state was set up in 1776, which was founded upon the principle of the rights of man, but even then they still remained in the field of what was practical and historically positive. They laid down no system as a foundation, no hollow speculations, but deduced their original rights of man from the old Saxon laws, which the North Americans had brought with them over the ocean from England. The rights of man, therefore, as existing before the union of men into states, were not previously set forth as in the declarations of the French constituent assembly, for in this latter case their principles are exhibited as immediate and axiomatic. These principles, derived from the old Saxon laws, were found already in existence before the declarations of the first Congress in 1774, when as yet there was at least no appearance of a desire alto-

* "That though the invectives of the solicitor-general made no impression upon him, he was indeed sorry to see the Lords of the Council, who constituted the dernier court in colonial affairs, so rudely and indecently manifesting the impression they received from it."

† Brougham's 'Statesmen :— George III.' vol. i. p. 87.

gether to break off their connexion with England; they are embraced in ten articles, of which for our purpose we shall only quote the most general:—1. Every man has an unalienable right to life, freedom and property. 2. The inhabitants of the colonies have inherited from their ancestors all the rights, privileges, and the freedom of free and native subjects of the crown of England. 3. They cannot have lost their original rights by emigration. 4. The foundation and the support of all English freedom, and of every other free government, is the right of the people to share in the making of the laws which impose burdens upon the state and set limits to their freedom.—The other articles are only consequences of these, which bear upon the particular relations existing between England and her colonies. These articles, at that time delivered as axioms, were repeated in 1776, in the ‘Declaration of Independence,’ in a manner so mild, so modest, and in such complete harmony with the philosophy prevailing at that time in France, England and Germany, as to gain all and to offend none.

The same may be said of the declaration against England, or more properly against king George the Third, in which, in a series of propositions, the whole history of his reign is represented as a continuous effort to destroy existing rights. These propositions apparently contain facts only, by means of which the government might be placed in a hateful light; but considered in another point of view, they show the aristocratic monarchical government of old times in the democratic light of the new. These propositions contain the whole gospel of the new political life, after which men began from that time forward to strive in Europe, and which they still venture to pursue, however often the might of the old has triumphed or may continue to triumph. In the declaration contained in the passage quoted below, there is found the very dangerous proposition, that “subjects have not only a right, but also in certain circumstances a holy duty, to make good these rights in opposition to the government, not only by words and arguments, but by force and arms.”*

* “That respect to the opinions of mankind requires that, when in the course of human events it becomes necessary to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with one another, they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation. They assert the unalterable right of the people, whenever government becomes destructive of those ends which it is instituted for, to form a new government on principles most likely to effect

CHAPTER II.

FRANCE.

§ I.

DIDEROT—MARMONTEL—RAYNAL.

WE have before directed the attention of our readers to Diderot; we mention him here again, as we shall do Rousseau in the following section, merely because the one, in consequence of his licentious romances, was held in the highest esteem by the members of the polite and fashionable world in the time of the American war, who at that period, as in that of Louis the Fifteenth, looked upon all sorts of debauchery as the privilege of rank and birth; and the other was exposed to the most deadly hatred in consequence of his 'Letters from the Mountain.' In order to conceive what importance the whole of the world of high life, princes of education and the high nobility, attached to Diderot's writings, to the immoral dramas and satires of Beaumarchais, and to the novels of the friends of the Duke of Orleans, (La Clos, or properly Choderlos de la Close, Sillery, Fabre d'Eglantine and others,) whom we shall mention in the following period, we have only to remind our readers of the reputation which Diderot enjoyed throughout all Europe. Grimm, called Baron Grimm, gained a degree of importance as the paid agent of the Empress of Russia, employed to send her daily by post

their safety and happiness. Prudence indeed will dictate, that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and all experience has shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they have been long accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a desire to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government and provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient suffering of these colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former system of government. The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having one direct object, the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states."

all the trash which was published or spoken by Diderot and his friends; and in 1775 he travelled with him even to St. Petersburg. The Empress was as little satisfied with his conversation as Frederick the Second had been; and in Leipzig, with all their admiration for the French, he was regarded as little short of ridiculous. She rewarded him however better than a hundred men of true merit. She caused a house to be built for him in Paris, bought his library, allowed him the use of it for life, and gave him money under pretence of increasing the library; the German princes made pilgrimages to him to Paris. He was visited in his house by the Crown Prince of Brunswick, afterwards Duke, of whom a great admiration was affected by French, and especially by Mirabeau, as well as by German flatterers. The Duke's military glory was somewhat tarnished by his expedition to Champagne, but nevertheless continued till the battle of Jena, and then suddenly disappeared like all other airy vapours. The Crown Prince (afterwards Duke) of Gotha was another of his admirers and visitors, and paid Grimm for every Parisian anecdote which he sent to Gotha. Prince Henry of Prussia stands in still closer connexion with the novels of Diderot, of which we shall take only a hasty and passing notice, in order to show that immoral writing and novels were at that time among the privileges of courts and the high nobility,—such writings as would be a reproach to revolutionary times, such as are now sometimes written by Dudevant and innumerable others for the great public, and are regarded as offences against public decency. Prince Henry caused Diderot's novels, which are full of blasphemy and indecency, to be sent to Germany in manuscript; and one of them, which had never come before the public, has been printed in Paris within the present century through his instrumentality. This novel has not reached our hands, and we can only judge of those which are contained in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth volumes of his works, in the edition published in fifteen volumes (1798) by Diderot's absurd panegyrist Naigeon.

The vulgarity, ill-breeding, and indecency which these novels contain are only compensated for in one of the three to which we shall refer, by any display of the author's skill as a literary artist; whereas Madame Dudevant (Georges Sand), although she scorns and despises all morality and all traditionary customs

or usages, and destroys the whole fixed principles of social life, awakens admiration for her wonderful talents, even in the minds of those by whom her motives and her aim are utterly detested. Diderot's first two novels are coarse, vulgar and low, and bear somewhat the same relation to the novels of Dudevaut, as the vulgar obscenities of the high nobility, whom Mirabeau mentions, when speaking of his tour of visits among the high German princes after the death of Frederick the Second, bear to the wanton scenes in Ardinghello and to the other productions of Heinse, or to Schlegel's 'Lucinde,' which Schleiermacher, although a philosopher, theologian and preacher, expressly recommended to the German public. The first of these novels ('Les Bijoux Indiscrets') appeared in the first edition of his works long before Diderot's journey to St. Petersburg and through Germany, and, if one might compare him with Petronius, shows how far Louis the Fifteenth and his courtiers, and all the noble lords who imitated them, were inferior to Tiberius, whose autocracy the great and the little lords at that time strove to rival. Diderot's wit and style of clothing his thoughts betray the cutler's son, who is well acquainted with the manners of his journeymen smiths, and accommodates their modes of thinking to the circle of his boon companions in the higher ranks, who were accustomed to assemble in the house of Holbach. A respect for public decency permits us to proceed no further in the exposure of the work, not to explain even the sense of its title-page. The second of these novels ('Jacques le Fataliste') met with no approbation from Naigeon, the foolish admirer of Diderot, the prophet and announcer of that insane atheism of which Diderot boasted, and who ventured to allege that he was altogether misunderstood by his age. Naigeon says, that at least three-fourths of the book should have been left altogether unprinted, as grossly obscene and audaciously immoral; we shall only add to this, that of the whole novel the obscenity belongs to the Frenchman, and the rest of it is a very bad imitation of Tristram Shandy. In reference to form, with the exception of one scandalous passage, the keeping of the third of his novels, *The Nun* ('La Religieuse'), is in some measure skilfully adapted to good society, and may be regarded as free from grounds for severe reproach. The author of this history read the work many years ago in his youth, but he remembers that his attention

was roused, fixed, and almost chained to the book, and at first he believed himself to be perusing actual memoirs, in which form the book is written. But even at that time he was filled with indignation, that art and talents should have been summoned to lend all their aid in a passage, in which Diderot describes an overwhelming passion and its gratification with the masterly skill of a virtuoso, such as Raphael's teacher has exhibited in his infamous engravings, and of which the satire of Arezzo has given us proofs in the sonnets by which these engravings are illustrated. The object of the novel is to expose the whole system of convents and their discipline to public hatred. For this purpose, Diderot invents the story of the seduction of a nun, which is described in a similar manner and on the same grounds as another side of the life of religious recluses has been described in our days in Spiridion. The plan of the story is so malicious and devilishly calculated and arranged, or at least it is in such perfect keeping and so well sustained, that one is long under the deception that he is reading a true report and self-confessions: the most scandalous part of the whole is, that the most wicked part of the narrative forms the plot. A man of science, therefore, such as D'Alembert was, was obliged to give up all connexion with Diderot, and with D'Alembert the world of fashion also forsook him; and long before his death (June, 1783) he shook off all that which he had only affected for the sake of the great world: he lived in complete retirement, and far apart from the saloons in the society of his daughter, who afterwards burned the remains of her father's works, and along with them the novel which Prince Henry gave to the public from the manuscript copy which he had retained.

The whole tendency of this generation was in the highest degree unnatural: on the one hand it was corrupted and demoralized by the court, by hypocrisy and luxury; on the other, it was zealously striving after freedom. All this will be seen from Diderot's stoicism, which was as little in accordance with his licentious novels as D'Alembert's severity with his court panegyrics and letters. Stoicism was however as little natural to Diderot as licentiousness; it was otherwise with Rousseau. Diderot exhibited the severe side of his character in his judgment upon the works of art of the years 1765-1767 (Salon from 1765-1767). In this essay he expresses himself with as much

zeal against the artificial representation of licentious scenes, as he has done in his article upon Seneca or D'Alembert in his upon Tacitus; but in his novels he devoted the highest efforts of his talents to the description and pictorial delineation in words of the very sensuality which in his essay he condemns. The times of Louis the Fifteenth and of Tiberius may be compared in this respect, that they knew only extremes, and pushed everything to extremes: Diderot and D'Alembert are proofs of the fact, the one having chosen Seneca and the other Tacitus as subjects for their panegyric. Diderot furnishes an especial confirmation, when in his zeal against aristocracy and hierarchy he proceeds to the very extremes of the Sans-culottes.

The last-mentioned fact might be inferred from his shocking dithyrambic, 'The Eleutheromanen,' if we had not some scruple about acknowledging this piece, first published in 1796, as Diderot's work; because, as is well known, the Parisians are not very scrupulous on such subjects*. Fragments of this cannibal song had, however, been already known in Holbach's circle, and to these fragments belong the two hateful lines which, with a very small change, were in the mouths of the bloody murderers of the most awful times of the revolution, and which filled all Europe with alarm and the most dreadful apprehensions†. Besides, we learn from the evidence of those madmen who in 1841 proved so injurious to the cause of true freedom, by their attempt to found institutions which should bring back the reign of terror, that Diderot and Holbach fell in with the tone which was reigning in those times. They made one of the contemporaries of Holbach and Diderot, with whom they compared him, their herald, and boasted of his poetry and prose, which was written in the Diderot style. In the dithyrambs attributed to Diderot monarchical government in general, not merely its abuses, is treated with ridicule and contempt, in the same way as this Sylvain Marechal, who is cele-

* 'Les Furieux de la Liberté' was first printed in 1796,—first in the 'Decade Philosophique, then in the 'Journal d'Economie Politique,' otherwise we would put no confidence in Naigeon. One chief reason, however, for not regarding it as a Parisian invention, is that many pieces are known to belong to that time, in which Diderot delivered his perorations at Holbach's. The poem itself could never have been published except in a time of anarchy.

† "Et ses mains ourdiraient les entrailles d'un prêtre
A' défaut d'un cordon, pour étrangler les rois."

brated by the dregs of the Parisian democracy, is reported to have raved against a belief in the immortality of the human soul and the idea of a governing Providence, which has been maintained and revered by men of all countries and climes*. Diderot purposely chose the form of bacchanalian madness, that in the dreadful imprecations of his rage he might pour out all the venom of his empoisoned soul against tyranny and tyrants, and then against kings and kingdoms. The insignificant literary contents of his writings of this description would entirely prevent us from dwelling upon, or even noticing them, were it not that Diderot's name was and is too renowned, and has been too often employed as a sign-board to recommend his allegations, to render it possible for us to pass it over without pointing out what he taught, and what it was which dukes, princes, and the higher nobility honoured. We have felt ourselves obliged to show, that the whole spirit of the reign of terror and its system were contained in the works of a man who died in 1783, and that the conspirators who raved in the same wine-shops of Paris in later years did nothing but appeal to one of those people, in whose writings in prose and verse the whole of the world of genius, luxury and fashion rejoiced and delighted from the year 1770 till 1780.

Marmontel's influence upon the higher classes in Europe was quite of a different description. Nothing besides shows more clearly how little the wide-spread reputation of this writer upon *belles lettres* depended upon intrinsic merit, and how little value is to be attached to the applause of the common world of readers, than a comparison of the importance which Marmontel gained in his time, with the substance and value of the literary works on which it was founded. In this work we cannot enter into a criticism upon the value of the writings of a man who, like many others, gained his reputation through Voltaire, be-

* The madmen who attempted to write the journal 'L'Humanitaire' in July, 1841, for the benefit of their companion and friend, tell us that "Marechal figura avec avantage parmi les Diderots, les d'Holbachs; il publia sans y mettre son nom un poëme philosophique, dont la hardiesse souleva contre lui les hommes de mauvaise foi, intéressés à l'erreur et la colère des dévots. C'étoit un requisitoire foudroyant contre l'opinion qui admet l'existence d'un être au dessus de la nature, et un plaidoyer plein d'éloquence en faveur du matérialisme étayé sur les principes de la plus austere vertu et embelli des charmes d'une poésie mâle et énergique."

cause our object is merely to trace the effect of his writings upon outward social life. We do not start from the æsthetic or literary value of the works, but from the admitted fact, that Marmontel possessed a great talent of moving with ease within a limited circle of ideas. He knew how to please and edify that portion of the public who read books for pastime, by exhibiting to them a pleasing appearance of philosophy and morality, and after Wieland's fashion of satisfying their sensuality without offending their sense of decorum. Marmontel, like all those who had passed over from ecclesiastical schools to worldly literature, retained that kind of spiritual training and habit which leads those who have been so educated to pay more attention to the form of the language than to the nature of the subject, and places its disciples in a condition to write books without requiring to make any great efforts of thought. That Diderot could not do, according to Marmontel's opinion, who alleged that he only understood how to write pleasant pages. Marmontel, who was pliant by nature and received an ecclesiastical education, like some of the men of our own days, knew well how to combine the extremes of literature, and to be, or at least to seem to be, something to all. He praised and sung Louis the Fifteenth, and was peculiarly favoured by Pompadour and the Duke d' Aiguillon, and withal he continued to be the friend and protégé of Voltaire, a member of the philosophical societies and saloons, and a contributor to the *Encyclopædia*. Voltaire helped Marmontel to distinction and renown for the same reason that he promoted the interests of many others; he perceived in him a capacity of becoming a perfect master of language and expression, and of rising to a middle point of excellence as a writer, where he could not in the least degree interfere with himself. Moreover the sentimental Germans were far more dazzled by Marmontel's reflected splendour than the practical and intelligent French. Among these he was first known as a writer of plays, and thereby gained a reputation in the whole of Europe, because the French stage was at that time the rule and model of all others. Marmontel's pieces, recommended by Voltaire, were very frequently represented in Paris and received with applause. It would, however, be absurd to speak of their particular effect or tendency, because they differed in no respect from other second- and third-rate pieces; it is, how-

ever, quite different with what are singularly enough called his moral tales.

These moral tales first appeared in the '*Mercure de France*,' the editorship of which was lent as a living to Marmontel by Pompadour, and he made it a very productive one by his narratives, and the applause with which they were received. We here find that virtue of feeling preached which has proved so ruinous to us Germans, because it does not so much demoralize as relax and enervate, and tends to mix and confound all notions of virtue and vice. And this was peculiarly injurious in Germany, because writers upon education as well as fathers and mothers were thereby deceived, and, instead of strengthening the mind by work, weakened it by feeling.

Virtue is not ridiculed and scoffed at by Marmontel, as was done by his brother academicians (particularly when it appeared in a religious form), and vice is never made to wear the appearance of virtue by any ingenious and covert devices of language; but it is made so easy, so agreeable, faults and omissions appear in reference to their effect upon the human mind so insignificant, that the immense gulf between perfect self-dominion and a sensual life insensibly disappears. Earnestness and severe discipline are presented as the hateful and dark remnants of a bygone age; weak feeling, sensitive compassion, single deeds of beneficence, readily awakened charity and pity, which spring from a feeling of discomfort at the look of suffering, and therefore all those sensitive excitements and natural emotions which may lead and help to virtue, are substituted for virtue itself, for that which in itself is good and right in the sight of God and of our own conscience. All this, however, would only have provided, as is really the case in many German books, a long and sometimes tedious series of innocent pleasures, of affecting actions, and tales full of amiable goodness; and Marmontel felt, like Wieland, that this was insufficient to raise up and retain a great reading public, and the one had recourse to the same expedient as the other. Both mixed up a somewhat strong dose of immorality with their tedious sentimentality, and by this means both effected a complete change in those views of life which had been handed down from the preceding century and announced from the pulpit. This change was experienced chiefly by the better class of their contemporaries, who were striving after en-

lightenment. Diderot's novels awakened only feelings of repugnance and abhorrence in all minds which were not dead to shame. Marmontel's dubious morality allured the innocent: he provoked no man by atheism as Diderot did, but struggled against and overthrew religious jesuitism by a species of immorality which was quite as destructive. It is wholly unnecessary to establish this by referring to those particular tales upon which Marmontel's fame was first founded, because we have a superfluity of this kind of literature in Germany; we shall therefore rather direct attention to his two greater works, in which the system which lies at the foundation of his moral tales is applied immediately to the state and to its important relations. The reception of these works, which were by no means suited to the French taste or to the Parisian spirit of the age, best proves how utterly impossible it was to maintain the old system against the general voice of the best educated and most illustrious part, both of those who governed and of those who obeyed.*

We can scarcely allege that the two works of which we speak, 'Belisarius' and 'Les Incas,' had any special influence on their time; they were too weak and too insignificant for that; we speak of their reception by the public, of the frame of mind and tendencies of the higher classes, for whom they were calculated. Marmontel himself gives us the best information, particularly with regard to the reception and tendency of 'Belisarius.' Frederick the Second immediately recognised the tendency of the book as correctly as the orthodox catholic doctors of the Sorbonne, and with all possible courtliness refused his *impro-*

* Marmontel says, in the 8th book of his *Memoirs* (Ed. Paris, 1805, vol. iii. p. 31), "Tandis que la Sorbonne, plus furieuse encore de se voir harcelée travailloit de toutes ses forces à rendre Belisaire hérétique, déiste, impie, ennemi du trône et de l'autel (car c'étoient ses deux grands chevaux de bataille,) les lettres des souverains de l'Europe et celles des hommes les plus éclairés et les plus sages m'arrivoient de tous côtés, pleins d'éloges pour mon livre, qu'ils disoient être le bréviaire des rois. L'Impératrice de Russie l'avoit traduit en langue Russe, et en avoit dédié la traduction à un archevêque de son pays. L'Impératrice reine de Hongrie, en dépit de l'archevêque de Vienne, en avoit ordonné l'impression dans ses états, elle qui étoit si sévère à l'égard des écrits qui attaquoient la religion." The following words prove (as the Pietists in our days the opposite) the object of all this, and how cunningly he used it: "Je ne négligeai pas, comme vous pensez bien, de donner connoissance à la cour et au parlement de ce succès universel; et ni l'un ni l'autre n'eurent envie de partager la ridicule de la Sorbonne."

matur. General feeling, however, was even then more powerful than law, for there was found another orthodox theologian who stamped the work with his approbation. In his memoirs Marmontel informs us with great self-satisfaction of the importance which the German princes attached to French rhetoric and superficial elegance, of which examples were then very rare in their own country, but which are now abundant. The Duke of Brunswick, then Crown Prince, and his Duchess did homage to the client of Pompadour, in the same manner as the same Crown Prince, afterwards Duke, flattered Mirabeau, who had been sent into Germany as the spy of the French government. And what is most surprising is, that this happened at the very time when Klopstock was obliged to find a home in Denmark, when Schiller with difficulty maintained a miserable subsistence, when Voss was forced to remain long as a schoolmaster in a Bremen village, and Lessing, who had never perpetrated or defended crimes like Mirabeau, or had given vice the clothing and complexion of virtue like Marmontel, was persecuted on account of his philosophical, his historical and critical doubts. We therefore quote Marmontel's words in the note especially in relation to the German spirit, and to the modes of feeling and action of the princes of the time*.

The historical political novel of which we are now speaking appeared at the very time when Marmontel was elected an academicien (1767), and therefore at a time when he was anxious to cooperate with his associates, in his own way however, for the destruction of the reigning system. He availed himself of the fable of Belisarius' blindness and of his begging, of Justinian's injustice and other topics connected with them, in order to bring before the great public certain political theories, and well-meant advice directed against the present system and the ecclesiastical police. According to his fashion, he despatches the historical part in the earliest chapters; the chief point follows afterwards, an altogether indefinite political morality, which was loudly applauded at the Russian, Swedish and Austrian courts,

* From the feeling of ecstasy, according to Marmontel, which the Crown Prince, who was still in Aix la Chapelle, entertained with respect to the Parisian learned society, he presented him to his duchess in these words: "Madame, vous désiriez tant de connoître l'auteur de 'Belisaire' et des 'Contes Moraux':—le voici, je vous le présente."

probably because it appeared as if it taught how it is possible to wash without wetting the fingers.

We shall only mention one section, because it will show the surprising contrast between the views of the princes of our times and those of the empress Catherine, Joseph the Second, and Frederick the Second, by the reception which this portion of the work met with in Russia, and that which it would now meet with in the same country. We refer to the fifteenth section which is especially directed against the views and the legal severity of the parliament and the clergy in reference to the prevailing religion. Catherine the Second caused this treatise upon *Toleration* to be translated into Russian, or rather translated it herself, and caused it, in her translation, to be circulated over the whole empire. At the present day this would not only not be permitted in Russia, but would be prevented if possible in many of our German states. We see how little men's views upon political systems coincided at this time in France, how powerfully the ruling feeling operated even upon the conservatives, and how skilful Marmontel and his contemporaries were, from the fact that whilst the Sorbonne condemned these remarks upon toleration, the Duke d' Aiguillon, who however as well as his king played the character of a bigot, appointed their author his historiographer. 'Belisarius' is indeed no longer read, but still praised by the French, for this book was for the saloons of its time what the 'Telemaque' had previously been, which however soon went out of fashion. It is easy to conceive that the book should obtain a more numerous class of readers among the people for whom it was calculated by its author, the less philosophy or even history it contained; but one must feel astonished that it could escape the notice of those persons who were then the highest and most indisputable authorities in the Parisian saloons, that, considered even as a novel, the work has neither probability nor variety.

The second novel found numerous readers in Germany only; in France, as is well known, this sentimental, bombastic, poetical prose had no success; yet the spirit of the age, so strongly directed against everything old, and perhaps the reputation of the newly-created historiographer, may have procured for it a momentary influence, such as similar books then had among the French. This novel, written in bombastic prose, appeared ten years after the former (1777), under the title of 'Les Incas;'

and the conquest of Peru by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century is adopted by the author for the attainment of his philosophical and political objects. By these means Marmontel wished to counteract the feeling and temper prevailing in the educated circles at the time of the American war, and for this reason alone we mention the work.

The well-known tale of the cruelties practised and inflicted upon the unhappy Indians by the conquerors of Peru furnishes him with a favourable opportunity of representing the evils of military government, autocratic dominion, and fearful religious fanaticism in such an affecting manner as to awaken feelings of horror in every mind. The rhetorical part of the work merits no commendation; for the prose, like Gessner's *Idylls* and similar books, consists of *membra disjecta poetæ*; the language is therefore properly a mongrel species, neither prose nor verse, and the subject is neither poetry nor history, but sometimes the one and sometimes the other, so that their alternation is equally injurious to both. The very form, therefore, suitably represents a time of relaxation of all social bonds and of dismemberment. It is idyllic poetry, mixed up with the corruptions of Parisian life. Were any proof needed that Marmontel's poetry and philosophy were still less worth than Diderot's stoicism, cynicism, and infidelity, it might be deduced from the memoirs of the renowned academician and historiographer, published in the present century ('*Mémoires d'un père pour servir à l'instruction de ses enfans.*' 4 vols. 8vo. 1804). We there see how hollow this philosophy was, how vain and pitiable the life of the saloons, and how courtly the whole frame and temper of the clients of Voltaire, who prattled about freedom and enlightenment precisely in the same tone and spirit as they did about the last opera or newest ballet. Marmontel, indeed, seeks to defend Diderot, but in other respects he falls in with the tone of the converted and penitent, as Morellet also does, and with great commendation brings conspicuously forward the institutions and old forms of the state, the ancient church and the hierarchy, which had been blamed and condemned by him in his previous works; so that he and Morellet, and, what is still more surprising, Raynal in his celebrated letter to the National Assembly, publicly admit that they had had no idea for fifty years past whither their philosophy tended, or what they wished to attain by its means. The old man declares in every page how important and ho-

nourable he regarded a friendly word from Pompadour, a look from Louis the Fifteenth or the Duke d'Aiguillon ; he shows how the weakness and pliancy of his character, which had been formed entirely at the court, in the saloons, and among the great world, which he so simply and unreservedly describes, had made an old woman of him, to whom the trifles and vanities with which he entertains us were of more value than all the wisdom of the world.

The Abbé Raynal, for many reasons, deserves to be noticed in immediate connexion with the two above-mentioned academicians and philosophers, who by a rhetoric of different kinds have obtained a reputation which has made them historical characters, and who will maintain their ground, whatever opinion may be entertained of them by writers who look only to the subject-matter of their works. This good-humoured member of the circles of Madame Geoffrin, Holbach, and Helvetius was the daily companion of Marmontel and Diderot, and obtained a reputation as the historian of the European colonies in India, in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same justice or injustice, as they did that of being philosophers and dramatists. Like Voltaire and Marmontel, he also was educated in the schools of the Jesuits, which had been instituted with a view to a better kind of instruction in grammar and rhetoric ; like these too, he had not learned the spirit of the Greeks, but the smooth and polished advocate-like eloquence of the Latins, and applied this at first to pulpit declamation. When he was long weary of preaching doctrines in which he never believed, he undertook the editorship of the *Divine Messenger of the Ladies* ('*Mercur de France*'), the model which Wieland adopted for his '*German Mercury*.' He afterwards wrote in the style of Diderot ; but we must place him in immediate juxtaposition with Diderot, not because he has some resemblance to him as an interminable talker, but because it is generally alleged that the best part of the work, on account of which he was banished from France, and to which he owed the reputation which he yet enjoys, was furnished by Diderot. It must be admitted that Diderot did not play the hypocrite and affect the courtier like Marmontel ; he was truly an enthusiast in the cause of his bold and heaven-storming theories, on account of which even D'Alembert at last broke with him ; he worked therefore willingly and

inexhaustibly for every man who would undertake to answer his audacious discourse.

Marmontel, Diderot, Raynal and Morellet furnish abundant proof, that memoriter work, rhetoric, logic, grammar, in which the whole mechanism of teaching and learning consisted in which youth was trained in the schools of the Jesuits in order to defend the church, were capable of being equally well turned against the church. Although therefore Raynal had been a jesuit in Pezenas, came as a preacher to Paris, and thought he was far from having preached amiss, yet he cast away theology altogether. From being a theologian he became a literator, who supported himself by his own pen, for which the French have a very polite expression (*homme de lettres*), as it is well known they have for other things which are called by very ill-sounding names. In this character, he wrote everything which would sell well, and among other things a history of the English Parliament and of the Dutch Stadtholdership. These books were destitute of any solid value, but Raynal showed himself to be a man of rhetorical talents and boldness, and this gained him access to the societies of Holbach and Helvetius, in which the spirit of the age was created and cherished. In these societies he gained a special degree of importance by delivering or propounding there many political novelties, which, as the friend and acquaintance of Messrs. De Puisieux and St. Severin, he had investigated and discovered. Turgot no sooner introduced political economy, trade and finances as fashionable topics of conversation into the saloons, than Raynal's loquacity mastered these sciences, and he selected an historical political subject, the history of the colonization of both the Indies, in order to secure a rank among the encyclopædists and the world of reforming philosophers.

The first edition of Raynal's philosophical History of the Settlement of Europeans in both the Indies must be carefully distinguished from the second; and the very circumstance, that the first is mere empty declamation, and that the second is in some respects a practical and useful work, and that nevertheless it was not the second but the first edition which secured a place for the author along with the Diderots and the Marmontels, is of importance as a characteristic of the age, of the saloons and their sophistry. The first edition appeared in 1770, and Diderot dic-

tated things for the Abbé's pen, which he himself had not the boldness to communicate to the public, and was even shocked that Raynal had ventured so to do. For this reason the academicians made so great a noise about this shallow work, that after nine years had elapsed betwixt the first and second edition, statistical information and other indispensable materials for such a work flowed in to the author from all ends and corners. Raynal's book contained things which Diderot himself, who supplied them, would not have ventured to publish, and excited great and general attention, like all those works originating in a feeling of repugnance to priestcraft, which by means of such writers degenerated into a hatred of Christianity, and from a striving after freedom from the oppression of arbitrary political rule, which often begets contempt for the laws of morality and social order. The circumstances of this case show very distinctly how injurious a political and ecclesiastical police is, which acts with too great severity and in opposition to the general feeling and inclination, in states which cannot unconditionally rule the progress of civilization and the course of private life, because it compels the most moderate friends of freedom of opinion to promote the extremes of freedom rather than the reverse. This appears from the fact, that such a man as Turgot, who in one point of view regarded the book of the philosopher as in the highest degree miserable, recognized it on the other as very useful for his object, and thus contributed to increase the reputation of its author. He guarded himself with great prudence and care from disseminating amongst the profane what he imparted only to the initiated. Turgot writes as follows to the academician Morellet, who was then in England at Turgot's expense, in order to make himself more fully acquainted with the industry, trade and manufactures of that country. "I am curious to know what opinion the English have formed of the History of the Two Indies. I admit that I admire the talent of the author and his work, but that I feel offended at the want of connexion in the ideas. He brings forward paradoxes which contradict each other, and defends the one with the same warmth, the same eloquence, and the same fanaticism as the other: one while, like Richardson, he is a preacher of severe discipline, at another as great an enemy of morality as Helvetius; one while full of enthusiasm for the soft and tender virtues, at another for wild licentiousness and an in-

solent, rude spirit. He calls slavery a villainous thing, and yet again he wishes for slaves; he brings forward nonsensical stuff about the theory of nature, about metaphysics, and sometimes also about politics. The whole work merely proves, that the author is a man of great talents and well-informed; he has no idea however that there must be a leading notion in a book, that it must have some definite object, but is carried away from one thing to another by the enthusiasm of a youthful rhetorician. He seems to have considered it to be his task to defend, one after another, all the paradoxes which he met in reading, or which had occurred to him in his waking dreams. He has more knowledge, more feeling and more natural eloquence than Helvetius; to say the truth, however, he has quite as little connexion in his notions and is quite as much unacquainted with the proper nature of man as he is."

This was the opinion of a Frenchman, and of a man so celebrated as Turgot, with respect to that side of the book with which we are not specially concerned; we subscribe unhesitatingly to his judgement, and only remark in addition, that Turgot, although he was altogether right, considering the subject from his point of view and in relation to his nation, nevertheless contributed to bring the work into repute, particularly the second edition. The mass of readers who were at that time wholly unacquainted with the sciences of statistics, political economy and administration, and who would not have read any book which did not abound in high-sounding phrases and which was not written in a high-flowing style, was made acquainted with many things by means of Diderot and Raynal's prattle, into the true nature of which this public could not minutely enter, because they had no previous acquaintance with the subjects. A French official newspaper, in other respects well-written, in its haste makes Stuttgart the capital of Bavaria. It was not therefore merely the ladies and prattlers of the saloons, but tradespeople and men of business of different kinds, and the people in general, who through Raynal obtained much statistical learning, numbers, ideas upon trade, commerce and political economy, together with all sorts of new ideas upon toleration and fanaticism, although these were somewhat immature. The remark holds good also of the King of Prussia, who, on other grounds, was no particular admirer of Raynal. He too read the work, and treated the prattler himself with great kind-

ness and hospitality, whilst he behaved with great harshness to Süssmilch and Büsching, because they were Germans; they were industrious, correct and trustworthy writers, but sometimes a little tedious, and were not recommended from Paris as masters in that department in which Raynal was a mere bungler.

The liberal party in England, which found in the writings of Raynal splendid praise of the English, their plutocracy, industry, and their whole self-interested wisdom, gave him a most friendly reception when he took refuge there, after having been condemned by the Sorbonne and banished by the Parliament; he was received with open arms also in Holland and Berlin. By means of his travels and intercourse with all those who looked upon everything which was recommended from Paris as pre-eminent, Raynal enjoyed the opportunity of giving a greater value to the second edition of his work, which appeared in 1781, than it had previously possessed through Diderot's declamation. The numerous statistical, administrative, and valuable commercial hints and information which were communicated to him in England and Holland, and sometimes from sources not very accessible, made his work indispensable till better ones appeared, and brought it into the hands of men, who saw completely through the empty declamation of the encyclopædists. In the period which intervened between the publication of the two editions, the American war had broken out, democracy become the fashion in Paris, and the new edition was accommodated to the prevailing tone. This tone was vehement, the work therefore was obliged to be printed in Geneva, as those of Rousseau were in Holland. The absurd manner in which the work was afterwards persecuted gave it an importance which it would never otherwise have attained, and which its author by no means deserved. The Sorbonne condemned the book in the most formal manner, and the Parliament, according to ancient custom, ordered it to be burned by the common hangman, and issued a warrant for the apprehension of the author, who left the country and celebrated his triumph over the Sorbonne and the Parliament in a foreign land, till he was quietly permitted to return in 1788. All the German princes who had received a French education and spoke the French language, as well as the English aristocracy, treated the Frenchman in a manner very different from that in which King Frederick treated Büsching, when he importuned him with his statistical affairs, as the latter

himself relates the whole matter with comical naïveté. Besides, it is undoubtedly true that Raynal, with his declamation, and by putting forward reasons and grounds of action easily understood, contributed far more to the dissemination of a sound philosophy of life, to the promotion of trade and commerce, and to the destruction of the prejudices of the middle ages, than Schlözer and Büsching with all their solidity and learning. It is quite another question whose services the serious inquirer should prefer.

§ II.

ROUSSEAU—BUFFON.

We must now return to Rousseau, because, as a democrat, he began first in this period to animate and rouse up the public mind in France and French Switzerland, in the same manner as Payne and Dr. Price did in England. We have here especially our eye upon the paper which, as a Genevese citizen and at the same time as the advocate of his fellow-citizens, he wrote in the same style as the unknown author of Junius' Letters wrote in England. Rousseau also wrote against the aristocracy of the smaller council and in favour of the rights of the citizens, apparently in his own cause, but properly with a view to prove legally and by documents that the Genevese aristocracy had usurped the oligarchical power which they at that time exercised. What he had previously logically and speculatively developed in his *Philosophy of Social Union* (his '*Contrat Social*'), and which was therefore not within the reach of those who were not strictly philosophical readers, he made accessible to every man of ordinary understanding, who had taken any part in public affairs, in the '*Letters from the Mountain*,' of which we are now speaking. His theory is here presented in a practical form; he writes like a man learned in the law, and by means of examples and illustrations makes what had been previously difficult and abstruse perfectly obvious. The attention of Europe was first drawn to his abstract principles of social union by means of these letters, because the disturbances which had arisen in Geneva on account of Rousseau first became violent in consequence of the '*Letters from the Mountain*;' the movement was presently felt throughout Europe, and especially in France and

Switzerland. We ought either to mention these disturbances afterwards along with those in Holland, or to have mentioned them earlier in connexion with those in England and North America, did we not here propose to direct especial attention to them.

The small council of Geneva, after the manner of other weak governments, with a view to gain the friendship or ward off the enmity of more powerful neighbours, was accustomed to yield up the cause of individual citizens or expose them to persecution, from a desire to please France; and in the affair of Rousseau, they strictly imitated the Council of Caiaphas, for which Dante has condemned him to lie crucified in the deepest hell, (*"Che convenia porre un uomo per il popolo a martiri."*) In this case the Genevese council wished to follow the example of the parliament and the archbishop Elie de Beaumont. Rousseau's *'Emile,'* which contains the confessions of a Savoyard priest, and expresses what are now called rationalist views, was condemned to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, and an order was issued for the arrest and imprisonment of the author. Neither of these resolutions could be taken against a citizen, according to the Genevese constitution, in the way in which they were adopted. When, however, this took place, Rousseau took refuge in Neuchatel, where with the consent and approbation of King Frederick William he was protected by the governor, Lord Keith, formerly hereditary grand marshal of Scotland. From this asylum he first published his fearful reply to the pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Paris, in which the arguments and cause of the latter are annihilated, without however descending to personalities or rudeness. He wrote nothing against the Genevese oligarchy, because he expected that the citizens of Geneva would adopt his cause as their own. Rousseau was doubly embittered against the narrow-hearted oligarchy of his native city, who had condemned him without a hearing, because they had entered into a sort of conspiracy against him with the high and mighty lords of Berne, who had intimated to him their dissatisfaction at his remaining in Yverdun. The whole of this persecution was as powerless and ridiculous in France as in Switzerland; it merely gave an importance to a man who was in no respect dangerous, which he would never otherwise have had; and as to his books, it was impossible for them to prevent their being printed. By this persecution he became an important man in the state, and the priests and the jurists of

the old system made themselves absurd and hateful in the eyes even of those who by no means shared in the opinions of this singular man. We need only be acquainted with the circumstances, in order to see in what manner the magistrates and authorities exposed themselves and the course which they pursued (as it were intentionally) to hatred and contempt.

The most distinguished persons in Paris fostered and cherished Rousseau, and were unable to express their admiration of him in sufficiently strong and energetic terms. The director of the public press in France, the noble Malesherbes, had superintended the corrections in the case of 'Emile,' although it was obliged to be printed in Holland, because it had been condemned by the archbishop; the minister therefore approved of a work which the parliament ordered to be burned. The Prince of Conti had given Rousseau early notice of the decree of parliament. The Duke of Luxemburg offered him an asylum and promoted his escape; the King of Prussia took him under his protection, and the Lord High Marshal offered him a pension. Thousands of letters poured in upon him from all quarters; pilgrimages, such as had formerly been made to the abodes of the anchorites in the wilderness, were undertaken in order to visit a man, no longer philosophical, but full of fancies and almost misanthropical; and still the lords of the old system persecuted him like a felon, and gave him political weight and importance in Geneva, instead of waiting, as they ought to have done, till the giddiness of fashion had passed away, which hurries on the mere mass of men by the empty sound of words, sometimes to servility and superstition, sometimes to fanaticism for freedom from all spiritual and temporal bonds.

Rousseau's expectations with respect to the citizens of Geneva were disappointed. He thought they would come forward without his assistance, because he knew they had long been discontented with the pride with which the inhabitants of the upper city (like the haughty lords of Berne) looked down upon the citizens, and he therefore naturally concluded they would espouse his cause, or that the clergy at least would protest against the conduct of those Protestant jurists, who treated the case as the doctors of the Sorbonne had treated it; he therefore began the war. On the 12th of May, 1763, he wrote a letter, which made an epoch in the history of the republic, addressed to M. de Favre, first syndic of the state, in which he renounced his privi-

leges as a citizen. This masterly letter*, which was written with great ability and in a spirit of extraordinary moderation, became the signal for civil disturbances within the republic of Geneva, and that on two grounds. First, the body of the citizens, however calvinistic they might be in their ideas and convictions, did not wish Rousseau, whom they regarded as the panegyrist of their city, to be treated as a criminal, but as a man who was in error; and, secondly, they were of opinion, that the course pursued by the small council had been unconstitutional. In this place, in which our object is merely literary, we must not enter upon a detailed examination of the Genevese constitution of that time, which, like that of most of the cantons of Switzerland and the German imperial cities of the past century, was of a very composite and involved nature; we must necessarily, however, point out distinctly a few of its leading features, in order to bring this contest between the citizens of Geneva and their oligarchic magistrates, in itself unimportant, into connexion with the general feelings and tendency of the whole of Europe. It will be obvious that the ‘Letters from the Mountain,’ by the development and application of the democratic principles of the ‘Contrat Social,’ had the same sort of effect as the speeches of Burke, Fox, and Barrè, and the writings of Franklin, Price, and Payne; and that, in the same manner as the latter shook the foundations of the feudal system in the north of Europe, the former rased them in its centre.

The citizens of Geneva at that time consisted of five classes, each of which had its distinct privileges and duties and its characteristic name. There were citizens of the state (*citoyens*), tradesmen (*bourgeois*), inhabitants (*habitans*), natives (*natifs*),

* “Revenu du long étonnement où m’a jeté de la part du magnifique Conseil le procédé que j’en devais le moins attendre, je prends enfin le parti que l’honneur et la raison me prescrivent, quelque cher qu’il en coûte à mon cœur. Je vous déclare donc, Monsieur, et je vous prie de déclarer au magnifique Conseil, que j’abdique à perpétuité mon droit de bourgeoisie et de cité dans la ville et république de Genève. Ayant rempli de mon mieux les devoirs attachés à ce titre sans jouir d’aucun de ses avantages, je ne crois point être en reste avec l’état en le quittant. J’ai tâché d’honorer le nom Genevois; j’ai tendrement aimé mes compatriotes; je n’ai rien oublié pour me faire aimer d’eux; on ne sauroit plus mal réussir je veux leur complaire jusque dans leur haine. Le dernier sacrifice qui me reste à faire est celui d’un nom qui me fut si cher. Mais, Monsieur, ma patrie en me devenant étrangère, ne peut me devenir indifférente; je lui reste attaché par un tendre souvenir, et je n’oublie d’elle que ses outrages. Puisse-t’elle prospérer toujours et voir augmenter sa gloire! Puisse-t’elle abonder en citoyens meilleurs, et surtout plus heureux que moi!”

and finally, subjects. The first two classes alone had any share in the government and legislation, and a citizen of the state alone could fill any of the superior offices. The number of the first two classes might amount to somewhere about sixteen hundred, whilst that of the excluded classes may have reached forty thousand. This great majority of the people was not merely excluded from all share in the administration of the state, but they were also in every respect more heavily burdened, and had no participation in numerous advantages which the sixteen hundred enjoyed. But even the first two, in some measure privileged classes, were seldom consulted about affairs administrative by the proper oligarchy, and not even listened to, when they wished to make good and establish their rights. Without any right derived from the constitution, by a cunning arrangement of the governing bodies, characteristic of the Genevese, all the power of the state was concentrated in the hands of a very few families. These governed, it is true, in a most paternal spirit, as the Bernese patricians had also formerly done, as well as many other aristocratic governments, and better perhaps than any democratic magistrates would have done, but it was still felt by their fellow-citizens* to be a grievance, that they should be treated like children, and remain under the discipline of the gentlemen of the upper town, and they would have been satisfied with even fewer worldly comforts and less physical well-being than that which they enjoyed, if their paternal regents had had a little more moral confidence in them, and no longer treated them as minors. The departments of government were arranged somewhat as follows:—there was a senate, properly so called, which was at the same time the superior court of justice and the government, such as then existed in our imperial German cities, at least in most of them. This small council consisted of twenty-five members, from amongst whom the four syndics were annually chosen by the great council; these syndics presided in the different colleges or departments of government. The first syndic was president of all the four councils, whereby the appearance of a limited oligarchy was counterfeited, without however deceiving any body. The first of these four councils was the general council, consisting of the whole of the first two classes. No tax could be imposed, no law passed,

* The disturbances which have taken place in Geneva during late years, have originated in similar feelings and claims.—(*Trans.*)

without the consent of this body : its privilege, however, extended only to the discussion of questions submitted to them by the small council ; it could originate nothing, and was subject also to the revision of the Council of the Two Hundred. This third council of the little republic was somewhat enlarged in the course of the eighteenth century, and from the year 1738 consisted, not of two hundred, but of two hundred and fifty. This council constituted the electoral college of the small council, which in its turn appointed the members of that of the two hundred. All therefore remained in one circle. In addition to the right of electing the small council, this body had also the privilege of granting pardons and conferring other acts of grace, as well as that of coinage, and was moreover a second court of appeal. The council of two hundred had the right of proposing laws or other matters for the discussion and decision of the small council, but had no rights of deliberation or decision except upon such matters and things as were laid before them by the smaller body. The fourth council, that of the sixty, properly speaking exercised no magisterial functions, but was a private committee, composed of the twenty-five members of the small council and thirty-five of that of the two hundred. This committee had the management of all secret and foreign affairs. The attorney-general of the state (*procureur-général*) was a most important person in this constitution, and was chosen every three years from the general assembly by the council of the two hundred. It was his duty, not merely to direct all the legal affairs of the state, but he was also their professional sophist, *i.e.* he was obliged to prove philosophically that everything which the distinguished and governing classes did and ordered to be done was admirable. The great council was indeed allowed to submit propositions to the small council and to that of the two hundred ; having done this, they could only use their privilege of negation (*droit négatif*), *i.e.* without being required to assign reasons, they could remain fast by their determinations. The great council was therefore only summoned a few times in the year on account of the elections ; for in other matters the governing body were anxious to dispense with their advice or their assistance. As early as 1738 a feeling existed, that this aristocratic, oligarchic government, which was made up of the members of a very small number of families, was opposed to the necessities of the age, and to the changes

which these necessities had introduced, especially in trading towns; and this feeling gave rise to disturbances. The consequence of these disturbances was, that the oligarchy was somewhat extended; but, as a compensation, what had been previously only a usurpation, became now a written right, and obtained a solid footing in consequence of the noble aristocracy of Berne, the trading aristocracy of Zürich, together with the military and monarchical government of France, having become sureties for the maintenance of these existing relations. From that time forward, the French resident and the noble patri-cians of Berne had great influence in Geneva, and both these parties had quite as strong reasons for persecuting Rousseau in 1762 as the prophet of democracy, as the Genevese oligarchy itself. The whole circumstances of this case very clearly show what strong confidence Frederick the Second had in the strength and firmness of his autocracy, and in the weakness of that of the King of France, and his conviction that he, like Napoleon, had the mass of the people in his favour, whilst the republicans in Berne and Geneva had it against them, and were therefore obliged, from miserable fear, to have recourse to contemptible and petty persecutions. He not only allowed the persecuted defender of democracy to take up his abode in Motiers Travers, but also from thence to commence and carry on a desperate struggle with the oligarchy in favour of the Genevese people.

The letter in which Rousseau renounced his rights and claims as a citizen first roused the general council from their slumber. Its members exercised their right, and complained that a citizen, who was respected through the whole of Europe, had been condemned without having been either summoned or heard. The small council acted as usual, exercised its right and gave no answer. Hereupon a formal breach took place between the two councils, and the great council put a stop to all public affairs by refusing to elect the four presidents or syndics. Other grounds of dispute were added to those in reference to Rousseau, and all this led to civil commotions in Geneva, which continued for above four years. These commotions and disputes between the citizens of a single city like Geneva could only be here referred to in order to illustrate the democratic and exciting letters of Rousseau; it will therefore be sufficient further to remark that the disputes did not terminate till 1768. Those who had become

pledged to support the constitution interfered, and were the means of negotiating a treaty (*édit de pacification*) whereby the great council received some unimportant new privileges and rights, whilst the great body of the Genevese people still continued subject to the ruling families.

Rousseau did not at first take part in this controversy; he only took up his pen when the deputies of the great council expressly besought him so to do, because all the distinguished talents and most skilful pens in the city were hired by the government. The then attorney-general, Tronchin, a man of distinguished education and talents, by means of some essays which he published under the title of '*Lettres de la Campagne*,' seemed to have given the death-blow to the cause of democracy, when the body of the citizens secretly addressed themselves to Rousseau. He then wrote his letters against Tronchin's essays, which were regarded by Rousseau as a masterly production. The letters were nine in number, written in rapid succession, and secretly printed. To these he gave the title of '*Lettres de la Montagne*.*' The book was printed in Holland, and, thrown unexpectedly as it was among the public, it produced somewhat similar effects in French Switzerland, which was then wholly under the dominion of the aristocrats, to those which were produced in England by Junius' Letters, although the subject-matter prevented these letters from being distinguished by that species of style which made the letter to the Archbishop of Paris a subject of the highest admiration. The Letters from the Mountain

* We shall quote his own words, as they are found in his '*Confessions*,' book xii, 2d part :—" Ces altercations [the commotions and controversies in Geneva] produisirent diverses brochures, qui ne décidoient rien, jusqu'à ce que parurent tout d'un coup les '*Lettres écrites de la Campagne*,' ouvrage écrit en faveur du conseil avec un art infini, et par lequel le parti représentant reduit au silence, fut pour un tems écrasé. Cette pièce, monument durable des rares talens de son auteur, étoit du procureur général Tronchin, homme d'esprit, homme éclairé, très-versé dans les loix et le gouvernement de la république. Siluit terra. Les représentans, revenus de leur premier abattement, entreprirent une réponse, et s'en tirèrent passablement avec le tems. Mais tous jetèrent les yeux sur moi, comme sur le seul qui pût entrer en lice contre un tel adversaire avec espoir de le terrasser. J'avoue que je pensai de même; et poussé par mes anciens concitoyens, qui me faisoient un devoir de les aider de ma plume dans un embarras, dont j'avois été l'occasion, j'entrepris la réfutation des *Lettres écrites de la Campagne*, et j'en parodiois le titre par celui de '*Lettres écrites de la Montagne*,' que je mis aux miennes. Je fis cette entreprise, et je l'exécutai si secrètement, que, dans un rendezvous que j'eus à Thonon avec les chefs des représentans pour parler de leurs affaires et où ils me montrèrent l'ésquisse de leur réponse, je ne leur dis pas mot de la mienne, qui étoit déjà faite."

are especially important, because when considered in connexion with Lessing's masterpieces of style, which were almost contemporaneous, with the works of Franklin and the English orators, and with those of the French classical writers of the eighteenth century, they furnish a remarkable proof of the striking contrast between the tendency of the classical writers of all nations in the eighteenth century, and the style and tendencies of those of the romantic school in the present.

In reference to the state religion, Rousseau, as well as Lessing, contended for the right of rational examination in opposition to blind faith, in a splendid and universally intelligible manner; and in reference to political constitutions, in favour of the participation of the people in the government of the state carried on at their expense and defended by their blood. He very properly divided the letters into two parts: the first is devoted partly to the defence of a principle, which was afterwards so admirably maintained by Lessing, in his writings against pastors and theologians, viz. that no authority should limit us in our rights of free and unrestricted inquiry; and partly to the defence of his own cause. The first six letters turn upon the question whether a protestant must necessarily be a believer in miracles in order to be entitled to the name, and afterwards upon the conduct of his Genevese judges towards himself. The last three letters, or the second division, are designed to maintain the cause of the democracy against the aristocracy.

The first three letters, to which also the fourth may be added, again form a peculiar division, because they treat exclusively of ecclesiastical police, and of the rights of the state in reference to the free expression of opinion; the fifth and sixth bear not only upon the conduct of the Genevese law-courts, and of the forms to be observed, which were not only wholly departed from in his own case, but also in that of others. These last may be passed over, because we refer to the Letters from the Mountain only insofar as in them Rousseau on the one hand struggles with Semler and Lessing for freedom of inquiry and examination, in opposition to the dogmatic theology of the universities and schools, and upon the other in favour of political reforms, in common with Franklin, Fox, Price, and Payne. The first three letters discuss the question whether a protestant state has a right to require a man to be a believer in the authority and miracles of Christ, in order to entitle him to the privileges of citizenship;

that is, to put the question in a more positive and historical form, they contain a discussion of the question, whether the state policy of the middle ages with respect to ecclesiastical affairs, against which only an occasional objection was expressed in the first half of the eighteenth century, was still applicable in the second, at a time in which the most estimable and the most learned men had protested against it.

In a strain of forcible logical reasoning, free from all declamation, the first letter treats of religion and dogmas, of the spirit of Christianity, of established religions and worship, in a manner which shows that Rousseau was a much better Christian than the highly eulogized Montesquieu had shown himself to be. Rousseau shows that what was recommended and praised as Christianity in the celebrated ‘*Spirit of Laws*,’ which had never been attacked by the aristocracy and was idolized by the bigoted English, was by no means the true spirit of Christianity, which he honoured and preached. He then proceeds to show, in reference to the accusation of stirring up others to rebellion and offences against the religion of the state, that it would be very easy, in the same manner in which his enemies had selected individual passages from his work, to select passages from the Bible itself which would furnish grounds for a much more vehement attack upon the evangelists themselves than was made against those who were accused of being encouragers of sedition and crime. We shall quote this ingenious and pertinent passage in the note, because, alas! in our days the same kind of accusation again threatens to be made against every man who is not one while pious and at another time rational, just as the spirit of the age or the genius or interests of parties require*. To

* Rousseau makes his attorney-general say, “We allow the severity of the law to take its course against a malicious, godless, and criminal book, whose morality consists in robbing the poor to enrich the rich (Matt. 13, v. 12, Luke 22, v. 26); in teaching children to deny their mothers and brothers (Matt. 12, v. 48, Mar. 3, v. 33); in appropriating to themselves other people’s goods without hesitation (Matt. 11, v. 2, Luke 19, v. 30); in giving no good instruction to the wicked, lest they should be converted and have their sins forgiven (Mar. 4, v. 12, John 12, v. 40); in teaching men to hate father, mother, children and kindred (Luke 14, v. 26). I complain against a book, in which the fire of discord is stirred up (Matt. 10, v. 31, Luke 12, v. 51, 52); in which a boast is made of arming the son against the father (Matt. 10, v. 36), a book in which the violation of the law is preached (Matt. 12, v. 2, &c., &c.); in which persecution is inculcated as a duty (Luke 14, v. 23); in which the kingdom of God and everlasting happiness are represented as the prey of power, and declared to belong to those who do violence, to encourage and make the people robbers (Matt. 11, v. 12).”

what is given below Rousseau adds the following: "What would you people say, if any spirit of evil or mischief should violently wrest these and such passages as these from their context, afterwards construct a whole from the passages so abstracted, and publish such a calumnious and injurious libel under the title of a 'Gospel Confession of Faith?' What would be thought, if afterwards such a scandalous calumny, calculated only to excite horror in every mind, should be trumpeted forth by some pretending Pharisees with a triumphant mien, as the doctrines of Christianity? This unworthy kind of polemical discussion leads notwithstanding to this point."

By means of this last-quoted sentence he paves his way to discuss in the second letter the state religion of the Genevese, and to speak of its reformation; and this forms the introduction to the inquiry, in how far it can be regarded as a sin for a man not to believe in the miracles of Christianity. On this point he maintains that it results from the very nature and essence of the reformation, and that the right must be granted to every man who has adopted its principles, if he recognizes the Gospel as a divine message, to understand and explain its doctrines according to the best of his ability. On this occasion he gives an explanation, to which every thinking and genuine protestant must subscribe, and which many teachers of the English church openly maintain, and in obedience to which some of its members have already separated from its communion, which we would also do if it came to that, that a man must profess a belief in the wooden dogmatics of protestant professors, or in the rites and ceremonies of the old church, in order to escape abuse and persecution. Rousseau says, viz. "If any man should this day prove to me, that in matters of faith I am bound to subject myself to the decision of any authority beyond my own, tomorrow I would become a catholic, and every truthful and consequent man would do the same." This leads him to the new popery which sprung up in the sixteenth century, and to Calvin, of whom he speaks in terms of the highest respect, whilst he explains his intolerance as the result of the spirit of the age, and excuses him in the following manner:—"In consequence of the continual strifes and disputations with the catholic clergy, a spirit of disputation and subtlety took possession of the protestants. In this spirit, which became characteristic of them, they wished to decide everything, to reduce everything to rule, and to pro-

nounce dogmatic opinions ; each with great modesty sought to carry out and establish his own opinions as the rule of faith, and to impose them upon others. Thus it was impossible to live in peace. Calvin was indisputably a great man, but he was a mere human being, and what is worse, a theologian ; he moreover felt all that pride which men of great understanding and talents usually feel who are conscious of their own superiority, and therefore impatient of contradiction. The most of his colleagues were in the same circumstances, but they were chiefly to blame because they were so inconsequent."

The principles here expressed he afterwards carries out in an admirable manner, and with triumphant eloquence and conclusive and irresistible arguments proves, that it was altogether absurd for any man to desire to uphold a belief in miracles, or a theory or system of faith which may be the work of one or any number of learned and pious men, together with the Gospel, by means of a state police and external power. He calls attention to the fact, that this is merely to choose certain individuals, and to set them up for prophets instead of the old church and its traditions ; and says expressly, "Hence I conclude, that the whole principle of the reformation is undermined whenever it is resolved to make a belief in miracles an absolute necessity in order to prove the divine mission of a messenger to announce a revelation and to preach a new doctrine. If any one assumes this necessity in order to confute me, he sins precisely in the same manner as I am falsely accused of doing." This is the point of transition to a consideration of miracles themselves, and to the development of a reasonable and moderate rationalism, which contains all the essence of that which Lessing ten years afterwards, and twenty years afterwards all the German theologians, taught, of what is now condemned by them as heresy, and, what is still worse, persecuted. Rousseau here points out a way, by means of the holy Scriptures alone, of arriving at a religion of the heart and the mind, without the aid of C. F. Bahrdt, without the explanation of miracles, symbolizing history, and learned exegesis.

We give especial prominence to these passages, because whilst these three letters apparently treat only of Rousseau's prosecution, and of the crime of infidelity with which he was charged, they discuss in reality, and with triumphant reasoning, the questions which were raised in the case of the 'Confessions of the

Savoyard Vicar,' and which kept all Germany in commotion from the year 1770. Germany was the only country into which Rousseau could find an entrance; for in Sweden and Denmark Lutheranism had become petrified, and the English church properly speaking is wholly popish in its principles, because it has tithes and livings, and bishops who are peers, and who jealously guard its temples against the admission of any ray of light. The last two letters of the first book afford less scope for eloquence, because they treat upon a very dry subject; but Rousseau, as well as Lessing, understood the very difficult art of compelling his readers to follow him even through the driest details. The subject of these letters is properly speaking the political rights of the Genevese state, Genevese law-suits, and judicial forms; nevertheless the sixth letter, and especially the latter half of it, is of as great importance as regards the new European law of nations, as the first three are with respect to the light of protestant theology, which was then beginning to glimmer in Germany. In the sixth letter Rousseau goes to the extreme limits of democratical principles. He does not stop where the English orators, or even Mirabeau himself at a later period stopped; he adopts the same tone indeed as Franklin, Price and Payne afterwards did, but in a somewhat different manner. In this letter he lays down with cutting brevity the subtle doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which he had set forth in his '*Contrat Social*,' defends it, and in the three following letters applies it to the Genevese constitution, and makes it clear and obvious by this application to existing institutions. In this way Rousseau laid himself open to attack, like all those who, without a complete and solid study of history or having gained a knowledge of mankind as they are and must ever continue to be in the narrow intercourse of life, merely fashion out theoretical constitutions. Every constitution, which is not strictly democratic, is presented in the same light as the oligarchical small council of Geneva. This circumstance has indeed contributed to give this letter a greater importance with all those who allow themselves to be carried away by their feelings sometimes into a fanaticism for freedom, and sometimes in favour of spiritual and temporal despotism, than the dry truth of reality would have had.

In these last three letters Rousseau starts immediately from the fact, that it has been alleged against him as a crime, that in

his work upon the Social Contract, he had propounded a destructive theory, and that his book deserved to be burnt, because he as its author had proved himself to be the enemy of all existing governments. Rousseau here developes in a few pages, and that not in the same subtle and logical form which had been done in his book, but clearly and concisely in a few sentences, the substance of this social contract, which at a later period proved so injurious in France through St. Just, and according to which the essential and inalienable sovereignty belongs to the body of the people in general assembly. He afterwards sums up the whole result in the few following words:—"In fact, do you not perceive feature for feature in the history of your republic, from its origin till the present day, this new original compact, this essence of unlimited ruling power, this dominion of the laws, this arrangement of the government, this manner of gradual concentration in order to compensate by outward laws what is deficient in moral weight, this striving after usurpation, these returning assemblies, this dexterity in evading them, this total cessation of them with which, in short, you Genevese are now threatened, and which I wish to prevent? I have therefore taken your constitution [this is very important as regards Rousseau's influence as the oracle of his time,], ye Genevese, for the model according to which in my opinion all states should be formed, and have been so far from wishing to destroy your constitution, that, on the other hand, I have furnished you with the means of retaining it. It is therefore singular enough, that my Genevese accusers have condemned a work to the flames, which, according to their opinion, attacks all other governments and constitutions, and yet has not been persecuted by these governments, because the Genevese constitution is the only one which is used in the work as an example for others, and which it labours to maintain."

We pass over Rousseau's defence against the accusation of being an enemy to all monarchical and aristocratical governments. The acute and very skilful manner in which the Genevese party strife is profited by is much more important for our chief object. Rousseau's object in these letters is to show how the nature and egoistical wisdom of all aristocracies are related to his idea of the object of a state.

"You ask me," he says, addressing himself to his fellow-citizens who do not belong to the small council, "you ask in what

condition your free state at present is, and at the same time what its citizens ought to do. The first question is much more easily answered than the second. The first only appears difficult because two different answers might be given to it. Persons of very good understanding answer, 'We are the freest people;' others, equally intelligent, 'We live under the severest slavery.' Which is right? you ask. I answer both; just as the case is taken. Nothing can be freer than your condition as it should be by law, and nothing more slavish than your condition as it now is in fact. Your laws are only binding because they are published by yourselves, you recognize only such as you yourselves have made, you pay only those taxes which you yourselves have imposed, you choose your own rulers, and these have only a right to sit in judgement upon you under certain definite and prescribed forms. In your great council you are legislators, unlimited rulers, independent of all human power. You confirm treaties, decree peace or war, you are even named from your sovereignty high-potent, most honourable, and ruling lords. Such is your freedom; we shall now speak of your slavery. The same persons among you who are appointed for carrying these laws into execution, are also at the same time the highest, indeed the only interpreters of them; they therefore make them signify what they will, and whenever they please these laws are silent; the ruling men are permitted to transgress them, without your being able to make them amenable for their conduct, for they are above the law. The magistrates, whom you choose, have moreover a power independent of your choice, and which does not spring from you." He then proceeds to illustrate his positions by reference to particular facts, in order to prove, as may very readily be done in most of the constitutional states of our time, that a freedom which is without power and securities for its maintenance is a mere illusion. With this he connects a representation of the manner in which usurpation and power have attained the privileges of rights in Geneva as well as elsewhere. He gives it as his opinion, that the history of Geneva furnishes abundant proof, that there, as well as in other states, the people have been gradually excluded from all share in the government, whereby all real power has fallen into the hands of a very small number of ruling families, and wherever only those rule who have power in their hands, he concludes, there is no longer any constitutional freedom. He adds: "Had any one ac-

quainted with politics been able two hundred years ago to have foreseen what has befallen you, he would have said to you, The political institutions which you are founding are for the moment good, but for the future bad. They are good for the purpose of introducing freedom, bad for its maintenance; and the very thing which at present constitutes your security, will hereafter serve to bring you into bondage." These sentences form the foundation of his examination into the nature of aristocratical government, in which with extraordinary acuteness he follows step by step the cunning rules which such governments have adopted, in order progressively to rob the people of their rights. For this purpose he avails himself of the rhetorical form of apostrophe, and appeals to a citizen, with whom he represents himself as speaking, in these words: "You see now, sir, the political intrigues of these people by whom you are governed: they make progressive innovations, but very slowly, without any man being able to perceive the end they have in view, or what will be the result; and when these are at last perceived and means of remedy are thought of, then they begin to cry out against innovations." These principles are insisted upon in a bitter and vehement manner, and the feelings of the Genevese people were as strongly excited by them against the small council, as those of the people of England against the king and his ministry by Junius' Letters. Rousseau on this occasion uses the different articles of the Genevese constitution precisely in the same manner as Englishmen used the English constitution or Blackstone; and he understood admirably well how to avail himself of particular occurrences for the advancement of his object. He does not, for example, confine himself to the course which had been pursued with respect to himself, but avails himself of similar cases, such as that of the prosecution of Bardin, the bookseller, and the case of a citizen who had been unjustly imprisoned for purloining, and had sought for satisfaction in vain.

Rousseau himself calls our attention incidentally to the fact, that he is merely the organ of the spirit of the age, and that he was engaged upon the continent in reality in the same struggle, that of promoting a growing consciousness among the people of their lost rights, which, almost contemporaneously, the friends of the people in England had begun to carry on against the king and parliament and in favour of Wilkes. His writings necessarily produced a great excitement through the whole of Switzerland;

for, with the exception of the very smallest cantons, all were more or less aristocratic in their government, or, as our sophists say, they were paternally governed exclusively by certain families, and by no means amiss as regards their physical well-being and material advantages. In reference to the pretended freedom in aristocracies, he says expressly :—"We shall in imagination remove Mr. Wilkes to Geneva, and he shall only there utter against the small council the one fourth of what he has caused to be printed and published in London against the government, court and king, and we shall soon see what will be the consequences. That they would cause him to be executed I will not allege (although the Zürich oligarchy caused deacon Waser to be executed because he had communicated a document to Schlözer which the latter published); but of this I am well convinced, that he would be immediately imprisoned, and heavy penalties inflicted on him."

This circumstance however shows how fruitless all discourses against prerogative rights are, when the subject cannot be treated as it was treated in France from 1789, and in Switzerland from 1798, because everything which had been already solidly and convincingly refuted by Rousseau has been since everywhere and on all occasions again brought forward, as if it were something new.

We pass over everything which merely relates to Geneva and its oligarchy, in order to touch upon some general matter, from which the relation in which Rousseau stood to the later defenders of the revolution will be self-evident. He states that, it had been put forward as a reproach against him, that the Genevese government had existed for two hundred years, and that no man had complained of it; that the constitution was good as it was, although neither the general will was consulted nor was there a very strict adherence to law. To this Rousseau answers once for all, and in a bitter and severe strain, difficult to be refuted by these never-to-be-shaken governments, or even by England itself. "All those who are in authority," he says, "even the least, even those whom we ourselves have chosen, are in a privileged condition, and strive after pre-eminence above their fellow-citizens." He here inserts a sentence, after his manner, which proves that he knew, and, what is more, desired to know, nothing of the people, *i.e.* of the masses. "Justice and law are necessarily connected with the condition of the people

who are to obey, an inclination to tyranny and force cleaves naturally to the condition of those who govern. Governments require laws, not to obey them, but to be able to apply them at their pleasure." This passage is here especially deserving of consideration, because it will be seen, that the excitement of the people in these letters no longer remained within those limits which could be permitted, but was manifestly hostile to all civil order, and yet less noise was made about them than about the 'Confessions of the Savoyard Vicar' or 'Emile.' Such are men! Rousseau goes still further,—he says: "The before-mentioned persons wish for laws, in order to put themselves in their place and that mankind may be afraid of them and of their laws. Everything is favourable to their successive usurpation; they avail themselves of the obligations which are imposed upon them, in order always to take upon themselves new obligations, or rather to usurp new privileges which they should not possess. As they always speak in the name of the law, even when they violate its principles, every man who ventures to protect himself against them is accused as a disturber of the peace and a rebel. He must perish; they, on the contrary, are always secured against punishment in their undertakings, and in the worst case have nothing else to fear than the failure of their design. If they have need of help from without, they universally find it, for the weakness of the weak consists precisely in this, that they are not able to combine in this manner."

"It is ever the fate of the people to have opponents for its judges, both within and without its own country," &c. It is obvious that, without wishing or knowing it, Rousseau entered upon that revolutionary path of demagogical flattery which Lammenais in our days has trodden; both have, therefore, and often in one and the same passage, woven together the most admirable truths and the most dangerous errors. In order to point this out, we shall here introduce still another passage in conclusion. "The true way to tyranny is, that people should be careful not directly to injure the public well-being, for should they do so every citizen is ready to stand up in its defence. No, the defenders of public rights must be individually attacked, they must be one and all inspired with dread, that no man may entertain a wish to become a defender of the rights of the people. Every man must be persuaded that the cause of the citizens at large is properly that of no individual, for thereby alone can the

slavery of the whole be established ; for when each individual is under the yoke, where then is general freedom ? When every man who dares to open his mouth is oppressed as soon as the words are uttered, where is the man to be found who will run the risk or imitate the example ? Where can the community find a speaker when every individual is dumb ? A prudent government, therefore, will rage only against those who show any zeal, but it will be just towards others till it may venture to be unjust with impunity. From the moment in which they may venture to enter upon this course, they will deal with justice as a good husbandman with his property, which he seeks to retain till it would be foolish to spend it." This passage alone will make it sufficiently clear in what way the 'Letters from the Mountain' attacked the principles of aristocracy on the continent, in the same manner as the various papers and treatises published in England and America during the war attacked the nature and principles of the English government.

Buffon cannot here properly come under our consideration in that department of science to which he devoted his peculiar attention ; but we connect his name with Rousseau's, to prove, that even the count, who was completely monarchical in his principles and especially favoured by Louis the Fifteenth, agreed at least in one point with the republican citizens of Geneva, and in that very one with which we are here especially concerned. Both produced a powerful influence upon the public of the eighteenth century by means of the materials which they brought forward, and by means of that rhetorical style to which they devoted so much of their attention ; and both sought, each in his own way, to create a life and science which should be in full accordance with the pretended philosophical tendency of the splendid Parisian circles. Buffon, moreover, kept strictly within his sphere, and we mention him here only as a rhetorical and philosophical writer, because he wished to embrace all departments of natural history in an equal degree, and to propound them to the educated world in an academical style. He deserves to be compared with Montesquieu in reference to the intentional and cautious manner in which he followed the new anti-theological system of the science and history of nature. He follows the same course in his department which Montesquieu had done in politics. The latter annihilated the ruling autocratical notions of the time of Louis

the Fourteenth; the other led to a new philosophical consideration of nature, which was opposed to the prevailing theological and teleological system.

In order not to be unjust towards Buffon, by stating that he became great not so much by means of the science which he treated, or which he induced others to investigate under his superintendence with a view to profit by the results, as by rhetoric and by profiting by the spirit of the age and by the circle from which that spirit proceeded, we shall quote what a republican, a Girondist, the Marquis de Condorcet, has said with respect to his method of treating natural history. We may with great propriety and force quote the words of an academician, of a man who shone in Paris society like Condorcet, because the Marquis was anxious to do honour to Buffon's merits, and because he only mentions incidentally what we call blame. "He ventured," says Condorcet, "to conceive the plan of collecting all the single facts and matters of experience in the whole field of natural history from which he might deduce a theory of nature, instead of merely giving a history of his observations. He desired to give a degree of life and attraction to the natural history of animals by mixing all sorts of descriptions with the artificial picture of their usages and habits, which he painted with all those traits and colours with which the art of a skilful writer alone can adorn his language. In a word, from that knowledge which had been previously confined to naturalists, he wished to create a new science for philosophers and for those persons in general who had cultivated their understandings and minds." It will be obvious from the word *create* that he had need of the art of painting, that he had need of the art of eloquence, and we shall therefore excuse his boldness on the same grounds as we do that of our own Herder; both were delighted in proportion as their readers understood the less of what the fancy of the one brought forward as the completion of the history of nature, and that of the other as the completion of the history of tradition, and everything of which no certain intelligence exists. Buffon's *Epochs of Nature* and his *Theory of the Earth* may always be read as poetry, although everything which he there announces as undeniably true as if he had been present and had seen it with his own eyes, has been quite overturned by more recent discoveries and experience, and shown to be quite untenable and arbitrary. The same is true of Herder's philoso-

phy of the history of mankind, only that it is more difficult for those who have not for years thoroughly studied the subjects and the histories of which he treats, to show clearly how arbitrary Herder's decisions are, how hastily his knowledge has been raked together, and how very imperfect his acquaintance is with the sources and even with the necessary accessory means in the most important things.

As to Buffon's fashionable philosophy, he drew back as soon as the impulses and motives of the circle ceased to be purely aristocratic, exclusive, and in some measure privileged, and when the communication of those matters to the people seemed really to threaten privileges and tradition. The other members of the society which assembled in the houses of Holbach and Helvetius took this very much amiss, and they often held him up to ridicule on account of his absurd manner of constructing his periods, like our J. H. Jacobi, or of dressing them out by successive elaboration, although he, as well as Jacobi, is still regarded as a classical writer. D'Alembert, Diderot, Condillac and others were accustomed, as Morellet informs us, who was daily with them, to call the ornamental and foppish count a mere charlatan, rhetorician, declaimer, and phrase-maker. They made the same objection to him which we would make to Herder's history, or, if you will, his philosophy of history, viz. that his style was neither suited to the object of his treatise nor to the nature of the subjects treated of. It was much easier for these gentlemen to verify this remark in the case of Buffon, than we are in a condition to do with regard to Herder. They said that his descriptions of animals appeared to them like those amplifications which were customary in schools; and they found fault with his artificial effusions about nature in general as being indefinite, false, and useless.

Whoever has seen a sheet of the first sketch of our stylist Jacobi, such as the translator of Homer was accustomed to show them, will be able to form some notion of Buffon's manner of creating a subject and style. Below stood the simple sentence, which became ever fuller, rounder, more delicately and ornamentally turned by the lines which were successively written over it. This will give an idea of Buffon's manner of working, only that Buffon did not so often apply to his pen as Jacobi. Buffon studied in a summer-house in a garden on his estate at Montbar in Burgundy, and wrote down his words page by page,

after having walked about in the garden till he had completely worked out and formed every sentence in his head, and in this way had completed a page. In his writing, therefore, it is universally obvious that everything came from the turning-lathe, and yet his style remained always serious and ornamental, whereas that of Helvetius and Jacobi, who worked in the same fashion, is often mannerized. With the boldness of our psychologists in creating systems and maintainng, hypotheses, as if they were the results of certain experience or even eternal laws, Buffon combined a clearness and high poetical soaring which entitle him to a place along with Herder, only with this difference, that in the writings of Herder this elevated and yet clear language is formed by nature, in Buffon it is the production of art.

Condorcet, therefore, in that passage in which he divides the writers of his nation into two classes, upon the best grounds has placed Buffon in the second, at whose head he places Corneille, as he does Boileau at the head of the first. He says, with respect to style, that the writers of the time of the classical style either calculated upon the convictions or understanding of their readers, like Boileau, Racine, Fenelon, Massillon and Voltaire, or upon persuasion, upon affecting the feelings, and bearing away the understanding without proper conviction, as Corneille, Bossuet, Montesquieu, Rousseau and Buffon. Buffon had nothing to do with politics; he was far too cautious directly to attack religious prejudices, as the gentlemen of his circle did, but he effectually destroyed, and that wholly without polemics, Bonnet's system of teleology and Haller's theological science of nature. His system, his hypotheses, his bold glances, his conclusions with respect to the connection of phenomena, although they have seldom withstood the examination of later inquirers, nevertheless throw a light upon nature, life and organization and the constitution of things, by which the obscurity of the middle ages was dissipated, theology entirely excluded from the science of nature, and the whole life of man enlightened.

The orthodox, calvinistic naturalists at the very beginning perceived what had entirely escaped the keen scent of even the catholic theologians, their parliament, and their police, for Haller, who was in a state of continual strife with Voltaire, as well as Bonnet, who, as is well known, pushed his physico-theology

to the highest degree of absurdity, rose up against him. Both Haller and Bonnet were better observers, inquirers, and investigators of particular facts than Buffon: they were more thoroughly conversant with the true science of nature than he, but theology always lent them a glass which made them see double, and their reverence for the words of the Bible, which is only the clothing of revelation but cannot be revelation itself, deterred them from following the soaring of their own minds, or otherwise they would have proved the most successful of his opponents. Condillac, among the philosophers, came forward indeed as an opponent of Buffon, but he directed his attack against his systems and hypotheses, into which we would not enter if we could, since we merely mention Buffon because he contributed more than most other writers to draw forth the new life from the obscurity of the middle ages into the light of experience.

§ III.

PHILOSOPHICAL POLITICAL ECONOMISTS AND POLITICIANS.

We should not venture to touch upon the history of a science which originated in Holland, was then extended to England, afterwards connected with the ruling philosophy of France, and which finally in our times has been ably and extensively treated as a peculiar department of science, if it was not our object to consider the subject merely on one side and with a definite object in view. The same spirit of the age which put an end to the dominion of religious prepossessions and prejudices in physics, compelled statesmen also to leave the common routine of office and have recourse to science, and in despite of the prejudices of traditionary usage in all departments of the state, to force on changes and improvements such as might make their governments correspond to the demands of the age. We concern ourselves with the illustration of this fact alone, and leave all the rest and the whole history of the science of political economy to those whose studies have been especially devoted to that department. It might be sufficient to mention Turgot and Dupont de Nemours alone, in order to show the relation into which the new science was brought by those celebrated men to the new creations of the revolution and to the government of Napoleon as well as to all those institutions which

have been made by other states in imitation of them : for the sake of clearness, however, we must go somewhat further back.

As to the two theories of political administration and economy, the single remark may be sufficient, that it seems to us that the systems of new economy which were set up in France in the course of the eighteenth century by De Quesnay and Gournay bore the same relation to one another as a conservative innovation to a reforming one, or as one favourable to the nobility who were possessors of the soil to another favourable to the industrious citizens. Both, as is well known, were afterwards combined into a third by Adam Smith in England ; all this, however, properly speaking, belongs to the department of the science itself. We are merely desirous of calling the attention of our readers to the fact, and to establish it by proofs, that the French had been taught, not only by Montesquieu, but also by men about the court from the middle of the century, that if they did not wish to remain far behind the age, they must imitate the English, and do, what they have now for many years gone too far in doing, *i. e.* recognize money also as a power in the state along with the nobility, the hierarchy and the military, and give a place near the throne to its possessors or those who are successful in its accumulation.

In the middle of the eighteenth century England had reached the highest point of exertion directed to the attainment of the material enjoyments and conveniences of life by means of industry and trade ; and the immense riches of one part of the community, which was always accompanied with the unspeakable poverty of the other, was however nowhere remarked. All other states therefore looked with an envious eye upon the rich and comfortably provided inhabitants of Britain, and a wealthy lord was the theatrical god of the novels. The sources of wealth in England increased to something almost incredible ; trade, commerce, industry, agriculture upon an immense scale, carried on by great capitalists in the spirit of a science and with the prudence of a trader, awakened so much greater attention in France, the less comfort the whole exclusively taxed classes of the population in that country enjoyed, the more dreadful the misery of the great mass of the people (which misery has now disappeared) and the poorer the treasury of such a kingdom, wonderfully enriched with all the products both of the north and south. Besides, neither political considerations nor that sen-

sibility which was so widely disseminated by the affecting novels of Rousseau, Diderot and others, furnished the immediate occasion for the foundation of the new science, for the promotion of agriculture and industry ; but a true and deep feeling of compassion for the indescribable misery of the working classes sinking under the weight of taxation. This feeling of compassion, which now shows itself in England in another way, called forth men who almost contemporaneously resolved to devote their time and their thoughts to devising some means for the remedy of this appalling misery. A physician named De Quesnay, and Gournay a merchant, proposed each his own philosophical system and views with respect to public wealth and its sources, and consequently with respect to the sources of profit and the means of promoting and increasing these as well as the well-being of the working classes and the income of the state. Quesnay, the favoured physician of Louis the Fifteenth, was the son of a landowner, and an enthusiastic friend of agricultural pursuits. He was very important to the king and Pompadour in consequence of his surgical skill, and enjoyed the fullest measure of their confidence ; he was thus in a situation which enabled him to gain over the king in favour of his system, the main point of which was to seek for the wealth of the kingdom chiefly in the cultivation of its soil. In this way Pompadour was led to take many steps which were favourable to civil freedom, and the king sanctioned the introduction of many measures by means of which the system might be fairly brought into operation. Quesnay's principles, like his position, were purely monarchical, although he sought to bring his system into harmony and union with what was then called philosophy in Paris, and he had friends among the encyclopædists. In reality he adopted that system which Sully had followed in the reign of Henry the Fourth. He recognized three classes of labourers,—the producing, distributing, and retaining ; but the first class, the producing one, in the narrowest sense, was that which according to him was to be kept chiefly in view ; therefore fishing, tillage, stone-breaking, woodcutting and mining took the first place. This humane man, who was prompted by his strong feelings of sympathy with the miserable destiny of the peasantry in France, devoted himself to his subject, and wrote essays, and contrived so far to gain the favour of the king for the promotion of his speculations, as if they were an amusement, that Louis the Fif-

teenth caused many of the short essays upon political economy written by his physician to be printed, examined the proofs, and himself corrected the press. He was anxious also, as is well known, to employ Buffon for the promotion of his forest speculations. As the king on the one hand caused Quesnay's essays to be printed under his own eyes, the encyclopædists availed themselves of him on the other, however far his religious and political principles were removed from theirs. They induced him to incorporate the results of his inquiries upon the improvement of the system which was now so oppressive to the country-people, in their encyclopædia. This he did in two articles upon "Corn" and "Farming." By means of these articles the attention of landowners was drawn to subjects which had never before been made so obvious to them; the friends of the Parisian philosophers mastered his notions, in order to make use of his views, and many ministers of monarchical states, as well as some distinguished princes of that time, applied his theories in their new agricultural and economical institutions. However little Quesnay thought of going as far as those who idolized him, and who had already begun to contemplate a possible change of the social condition of the nation and of the government, he nevertheless insisted that all villainage or dues to the lords of the soil should be abolished, the internal commerce of the country freed from tolls, and the trade in corn be placed on a free footing. The better and more noble-thinking portion of the aristocracy so much the more freely did homage to Quesnay's principles, as the landowners, in reference to the management of their great landed properties and domains, clearly saw that Quesnay was quite right in his principle when he affirmed that the interests of the peasants and their own were identical.

Among the most remarkable adherents and favourers of Quesnay's system we must particularly refer to the father of Count Mirabeau, who has become immortal in and through the revolution. The elder Mirabeau, as well as his brother, who was a commander of the Maltese order, must be reckoned among the original geniuses of Provence, who united unlimited pride with the tenderest humanity, and having minds susceptible of being impressed with great ideas often appeared inspired or embittered almost to madness. It appears from the letters of Mirabeau's father and uncle, which have been published in the present cen-

tury, that, although the former was the most celebrated, the latter far excelled him in Provençal originality. Mirabeau's father was indisputably the most renowned of the two, and on the one hand played the democrat, whilst on the other he and his brother carried their Provençal pride of nobility, their pretensions and imaginary claims, to an almost incredible extent, as appears from their correspondence, which is in other respects clever and original. Mirabeau's book, from which he received the name by which he was usually designated, the "Friend of the People," however little friendly his behaviour was, laid the foundation of Marat's hateful journal, which was afterwards published under the same title. This Friend of the People, the Marquis Victor Riquetti de Mirabeau, was not merely an unwearied defender of Quesnay's system, but also his personal friend. He has written above twenty volumes upon the new theories of political economy, and published an eulogy upon its originator, which obtained quite a peculiar kind of celebrity in its time and furnished abundant materials to scoffers and satirists, in consequence of the absurd tone with respect to the people in which it was composed.

'The People's Friend,' written by a domestic tyrant, appeared in 1755 in five volumes, but it contributed to make the new science neither clearer nor more popular, for its style was declamatory and adventurously bombastical, and his own character formed so strong a contrast with the principles which he preached that he made very few proselytes. During the very time in which he was manifesting an almost comical zeal for the well-being of the people and for the principles upon which, according to his sect of economists, this well-being was to be founded, he was proving himself by the most scandalous conduct to be a domestic tyrant over his wife and children, a most detestable egoist, and a bad member of the state. When we know the manner in which the then government, in their arbitrary discretion, behaved towards Mirabeau's father, and the manner in which, at the request of his father, they behaved towards the son, we find an easy explanation of his conduct in having recourse to every possible means to set legal limits to the arbitrary rule of the ministers. As soon as circumstances were favourable to his design, Mirabeau's father, the so-called friend of the people, was not merely obliged to undergo much annoyance in consequence of his two papers upon the advantage and necessity of

provincial assemblies, but he was even thrown into the Bastille on account of his treatise upon taxation ('*Théorie de l'Impôt*').

We have moreover introduced Mirabeau's 'Friend of the People' in this place, not so much on account of many of his other books, as on account of two of them in particular, which he wrote in connexion with Quesnay himself. The one contains a full development of a system of a political constitution founded upon the due management and culture of the soil of the kingdom, such as Quesnay had conceived might be carried into practice; the other, a short and clear explanation of the essential points of the new system. He and his coadjutor Quesnay called the one the *Philosophy of Agriculture* ('*Philosophie Rurale, ou Economie générale et particulière de l'Agriculture*,' 1764, 3 vols. 12mo.); the other, *Elements of Rural Economy*, ('*Elémens d'Economie Rurale*,' 1767 and 1768). Most of the writings of this singular man were intended to trumpet forth the praises of the new system, or to point out its relation to all possible branches of the financial and economical administration of the state; and a number of other noble authors followed the example of the Provençal marquis. Many other foreign princes did homage to the principles of Quesnay, and among the rest Charles Frederick of Baden, and Leopold, then Grand Duke of Tuscany, both of whom (as long as Leopold was not emperor) were in general acknowledged as wise and paternal rulers of the countries under their dominion,—countries which are blessed by heaven above most other lands. Their wise laws and institutions, which were praised through the whole of Europe and recommended as models by the philosophers who were at that time in no way favourable to princes in general, were the fruits of the study of Quesnay's system, and both of them showed great attention to his friend, the singular marquis Mirabeau. The emperor Joseph the Second also preferred the pure monarchical system of Quesnay to that of Gournay, which was of an opposite stamp, because the former alone appeared applicable in states absolutely governed, whilst the other must always be very imperfectly carried out where complete civil freedom does not exist.

Gournay's system of finance and administration necessarily found a great many enthusiastic defenders at a time when it was no longer possible to retain the European public any longer in the bonds of the seventeenth century, because Gournay especially took up the cause of those persons who have now everywhere

a seat and voice along with the high nobility. There are now, after a hundred years, upon the continent also usurers and speculators who are no longer plebeians, but a kind of patricians who deal in money, change life into a great machine, found a new species of voluntary bondage among the working classes, and live in greater luxury than princes. Gournay, who died in 1759, had been a merchant before he was admitted into the ministry; he had a large mercantile house in Cadiz, and, what was very unusual in those days, he combined theoretical study with his practical business. As the principles of trade and commerce had been entirely neglected in France since the time of Colbert, he devoted himself to the study of Dutch and English works, contributed the aid of his knowledge to the French ministry from 1744, and was afterwards appointed president of the board of trade. He created a French system of trade, whose principles he drew from the works of Petty, Davenant, Gee, Child, and other English sources, and applied the means which were at his command as a high government officer to advance his new system by means of writers and all other methods. At Gournay's request, Dangeuil wrote his work upon the comparative advantages and disadvantages of England and France as trading countries, in which he adopted an English writer as his basis; Forbonnais made an abridgement of King's *British Tradesman*, and Gournay himself in connexion with Forbonnais wrote upon trade in general. The system which Gournay set up, and promoted by every means in his power, was still less capable than that of Quesnay of being united with the still existing and firmly settled limits of feudalism, corporations, privileges, and individual claims of the middle ages. Gournay maintained that not merely the industry and occupations of the citizens of the state, which exclusively Quesnay called productive labour, but that according to his system every species of labour, every department of the arts, every kind of activity directed towards gain, created and increased national wealth.

If Gournay had been obliged to make an application of his system of industry and gain, and consequently also of the increased wealth of the state, which is the aggregate of its individual members, and of the government, which draws its means from the treasury of the state, he must have necessarily gone much further than Quesnay, who only demanded the abolition of villainage, inland tolls, and of all limitation of the trade in corn,

He was therefore a zealous opponent of corporate rights, guilds, and monopolies; in short, of all fetters upon trade, or upon any species of commerce or gain. He was one of the blind enthusiasts for industry, and consequently a great admirer of England and of the mighty lever by which everything is there effected, money. He might be compared to all those who in Germany have shouted till we are nearly deaf, and filled all the newspapers with their outcries; he paid no attention to the difference of the countries in point of situation, to national peculiarities, to religion, forms of government, and the like, but preached only England and gain. We shall not allow ourselves to enter upon the consideration of the real substance and nature of his system, upon its value or worthlessness, its applicability or theoretic emptiness; we always keep steadily in our eye the slowly and almost insensibly approaching revolution, of which we see and wish to point out traces and signs in all the works to which we direct the attention of our readers. In relation to this it will be obvious, that as soon as this system was favoured by the government, the provincial divisions of the kingdom, parliaments, corporations, and privileges were annihilated in thought, long before they were formally abolished. In order to make this point perfectly clear, we shall refer to and bring forward some of those demands which Gournay had made from the nation and its government as early as the middle of the eighteenth century.

As has been already observed, he required in the first place freedom for all branches of trade, and consequently a free trade in corn. Gournay further required that every citizen of the kingdom of France should have free permission to engage in every species of commerce or profitable employment, without distinction and without reference to rank or religion. He required that the state should take especial care that every citizen should have free opportunity to labour, in order that competition and the perfection of the various branches of manufactures might be promoted, and at the same time the greatest advantages be secured to purchasers in reference to the price of the goods. In the same manner all obstructions were to be removed which might obstruct or increase the expenditure of those who had articles for sale; everything was to be open and free. Both Quesnay and Gournay wished to set the producing classes, who were particularly favoured by them, free

from every burthen ; in this indeed they were obliged to cross one another's path, and it immediately appeared that it was altogether impossible, in states like ours, such as they have been formed since the seventeenth century, to confer special outward advantages upon one class of the citizens of the state without depriving others of something to which they were entitled. This circumstance led to an uncommonly vehement and bitter controversy between the two new schools of political economy. This controversy would indeed have been easily arranged, if on either hand the advocates of the one or the other system had been first united in their ideas about the overthrow of all the limits of the middle ages : the two systems only needed to be amalgamated. Quesnay, like those who form the majority in England, wished to roll off the burthens of the state from the landowners and agriculturists, and heap them upon the capitalists and merchants, and through these upon the dealers and artisans. Gournay wished, if it were possible, to abolish all taxes upon trade, and, if that were not possible, to throw at least the weight of taxation upon the land alone.

Both the Italians Filangieri and Beccaria, to whom a place is usually assigned along with Montesquieu, were favourably disposed towards the system of Gournay, and the deep and clear-thinking Hume also defended it. Two other men of learning, the one a Scotchman and the other a Frenchman, created a third system by the fusion of these two. If our object were to write the history of the literature of political economy, or that of political economy itself, we must necessarily first mention and dwell upon the labours of Adam Smith ; but we can only mention him in passing, because our plan requires us to select those French writers only who prepared the way for a complete change in the forms of the state, by the new theories which they promulgated in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Among these the first place is indisputably due to Turgot, a man who was a solidly educated philosopher and classic. This is so much the more the case, as he united with Voltaire's friends, Diderot and D'Alembert, not from any feelings of licentiousness or vanity, but from a true zeal for the improvement of the political institutions which were now become antiquated and useless. He was not, like them, an opponent of religion, of the valuable parts of the ancient faith, or even of the morality of Christianity, which requires those who adopt it to renounce the vanities of

the world and the lusts of the flesh. Besides, Adam Smith also enjoyed the intercourse of those persons who were called philosophical economists in Paris, and learned much from their personal and instructive conversation, which was always of a scientific character. Adam Smith relinquished the situation which he held in Scotland in order to accompany the Duke of Buccleuch on his travels, and at this time, 1765, entered much into the society of the Parisian philosophers, in which he was very acceptable. Even if we could here speak at length of the Scotch writer, Turgot must necessarily be mentioned before him in order of time, because he had not only developed his system in particular treatises earlier than Smith, or at least caused it to be developed by Morellet, but as minister of trade he also applied it before the other published his celebrated work. Smith's work upon the 'Wealth of Nations' appeared in 1776. It is no part of our business to point out or explain the relation of the works of these two renowned writers to one another; we have only to explain the relation of that of Turgot to French political economy and administration. Turgot, like Rousseau, Malesherbes, Lafayette and other men of this time of general movement, although he may have done much deserving of censure, as all other men do, belongs to the most pleasing phenomena in history, which reconcile us with mankind, and console us for the pain which we feel from the reflection that knowledge in general has been as dangerous to peaceful virtue as wealth has been. Among the band of vain and alluring sensualists and visionaries, of boasting and clever sophists, and of faithless rhetoricians who changed their principles as easily as their dress, he, like the men whose names have been mentioned, as well as Madame Roland and the studious Languinai, appears as a noble soul elevated by the hope of the approaching regeneration of his nation; he was indeed deceived, as all of us are accustomed to be deceived by the dreams of our youth.

Turgot was descended from an ancient and very distinguished family in Normandy, and when pursuing his studies to prepare himself for the office of some of the higher ecclesiastical dignities, was a fellow-student of the Abbé Morellet, whom we here mention in connexion with him because he played only a second-rate character among the so-called philosophers, but was nevertheless amongst those who were used by Turgot and by the government as writers. We can therefore draw here

and there from Morellet's memoirs the best accounts of Turgot's labours, sometimes as a man of business, president of the department of trade and minister, and sometimes as a writer who endeavoured by means of literature to bring the administration of the state into accord with the demands of the age. Turgot was brought up wholly in the old and, in its way, admirable school of the Sorbonne, and trained for a theological logician; he began however to shrink back from the thought of being obliged to defend the scholastic theology, of whose utter untenableness he and every thinking man in France at that time were fully convinced. Instead of the theological he embraced the legal profession, became a councillor of parliament, and afterwards (1752 and 1753) *maître de requêtes*. This happened at the time at which the authors of the great Encyclopædia were desirous of founding and disseminating amongst all classes of men a new science, which was intended for life, as the old had only been for the schools. Diderot indeed afterwards abused this organ or magazine in order to shake the foundation of all principles and all traditionary faith; the plan however originally was briefly to treat in single articles the whole circle of the arts, sciences, and practical occupations of life, according to the progress of the Dutch and English; and in this sense and with this view alone did Turgot become a contributor.

At the time in which Turgot was in the council of state, several men were engaged in the department of the finances, who might be reckoned among the most distinguished Frenchmen of their day, who were the more eagerly engaged in introducing improvements, the worse the whole system was, the more severe the oppression, and the more frequent the change of the ministers of finance. The same was precisely the case in matters of instruction and in the censorship. We shall only mention a few names, in order to show that the conviction had become a prevailing one even among the very officials of the absolute government in the middle of the century, that it would be quite impossible to carry on the old system in the old manner for any length of time. Malesherbes was censor of the press; Trudaine de Montigny, father and son, superintendents of finance; Gournay, superintendent of the affairs of trade; Turgot, reporter of the council of state. These men had recourse to all possible means to prepare the minds of men for a thorough and searching reform. They at first endeavoured, by means of treatises,

books and articles in the *Encyclopædia*, to advance their plans, which as men of business they dared not at that time officially promote in their respective departments. Turgot now studied Quesnay's writings with great care and assiduity; and Quesnay was in a position, from being physician to the king and to Pompadour, to do more for his benevolent and humane purpose than any minister of them all. Turgot was closely connected with Gournay by their respective occupations, and was almost daily in his society; he must therefore very naturally have fallen upon the thought of combining the systems of his two friends, which were merely apparently contradictory. This he did in some articles which he contributed to the great *Encyclopædia*, under the letters E and F. The articles 'Expansibilité,' 'Existence,' 'Etymologie,' 'Foire' and 'Fondation' are complete treatises, which fill a great many sheets. The articles 'Foire' and 'Fondation,' as well as the portion of Turgot's works which extends from the fourth till the seventh volume in the edition published in 1810, contain the full gist of the theory which he formed by the application of the essential contents of these papers for the improvement of French political economy and finance. He introduced his old school companion Morellet, who had attached himself to the philosophers and had been brought into the academy by their influence, but who in other respects belonged to that numerous class of skilful French writers who knew how to treat every given subject, which neither demanded deep thinking nor extensive learning in their peculiar style; he introduced him at the houses of Gournay and Trudaine, in order that they might avail themselves of his services to work upon the public as it is called. Morellet was accordingly employed by these practical economists for these purposes, precisely in the same way as in our days, especially in England and France, ministers have hundreds of men in their employ merely to fabricate truths for the public.

We shall first follow out this last point, because it furnishes us with an opportunity of showing, that public opinion, which up to this time had been treated with open contempt, but which in our days has proved itself and will prove itself more powerful than officials, bayonets, police, the censorship and gens-d'armes, was already employed by the ministry in order to gain a victory over the power of prejudice by means of ingenious and clever discourses. Morellet was first employed by Trudaine, in the same

way as he was afterwards employed by Turgot. In 1758, at the instigation of Gournay, who died in the following year, Trudaine made the first attempt to put an end to those burthensome limitations to trade which were obliged to be maintained by despotic regulations, which went even as far as domestic search. The defenders of prejudices and privileges had also their sophists, who, with apparently well-founded reasons, tried to defend every privilege, every wrong which by time had become a right, and every limitation imposed upon the people of the state; these defenders hated such men as Trudaine and Turgot, who were far remote from all lightness and wantonness of character, more than the Holbachs and Diderots, and especially more than Helvetius, who was so renowned and celebrated in the world of fashion. Trudaine was obliged to use Morellet in opposition to one of these writers, named Moreau, in the same way as Voltaire indicated by a pun (*mords-les*) that he might be employed against the Obscurists of his age. Moreau had risen up against the Encyclopædists and the originators of the new political economy, in the same way as similar people among us now stand up for the faith of the middle ages, or for the wooden dogmatics of the seventeenth century. All the weapons of sound reason are utterly useless against such persons; they can only be put down and conquered by ridicule and scorn. And it is seen that, then as in our days, scoffers and sceptics alone could keep the field, for every man who spoke either with reason or moderation was thrown into the Bastille. Marmontel experienced this fate, as did Morellet also, who, after having completely conquered Moreau, the defender of every prejudice*, upon a question which had not the most remote connexion with politics or religion, wrote several similar papers against the old policy of the state and in favour of the new. Trudaine was moreover an example of the manner in which things were conducted under the old government in France; he used Morellet as his tool, for he himself took very little part, for the office of intendant had descended from his grandfather to his father, and had come in regular succession from his father to him.

The Board of Trade, and all intelligent men in France from the year 1754 had been gained over to the new system, and those

* Morellet wrote, March 1758, at the request of the board of trade, 'Reflexions sur les avantages de la libre fabrication et de l'usage des toiles peints en France.'

tradespeople only who had profited by the obstructions, limitations and hindrances of all sorts were opposed to it; the ministry itself, in every step which it wished to take in order to introduce improvements, was obliged to appeal to public opinion. The members of the Board of Trade as early as 1762 were desirous of doing away with all international tolls, all protecting duties as they are called, which would have been at that time by far too hasty a step, and a mighty outcry was raised against them. The resistance however did not spring from those who had any right to protest that experiments should not be made upon the citizens of the kingdom according to a system hewed and fashioned out in the cabinet, but from quite a different quarter. The tradespeople who dealt in articles that were protected within the kingdom by duties had a much greater influence than the manufacturers of Lorraine and Bar, who would have gained greatly by the abolition of restrictions. The ministry tried to put the opposition to silence by means of Morellet and an appeal to public opinion. In the same manner as Turgot, who was intendant in Limoges, presented the unheard-of example of a man from whose writings, decrees and institutions a manual of principles of administration might have been collected, which were humane and enlightened, but at the same time suited to the established religion and traditionary usages and customs; it was also an unheard-of step for the authorities to appeal to the people by means of Morellet. The tradespeople in their turn had also recourse to a writer; and it now appeared for some time as if the period had at length arrived, at the close of the seven years' war, when public affairs would be treated in a public manner. There appeared as a writer in favour of the public, on whose side Necker also took his stand, the same Coster, of whose services Necker afterwards availed himself, in the same way as Turgot had availed himself of those of Morellet. This is the same Coster who, at the time of the assembly of the Notables, wrote for Necker against the parliament.

The then condition of France was, alas! in that respect to be compared with the present condition of Germany; the old was indeed no longer acknowledged, but the new could gain no footing, and if at some moments it appeared as if a new path would be opened and trodden, presently again the whole of the ancient despotism presented itself in its most fearful form. This immediately appeared in reference to the open and scientific manner of treating subjects of political economy and administration,

and the policy of the state connected with them, as soon as a theological jurist had become finance minister. L'Averdy was no sooner named controller of finance than he published a decree, in 1764 (*arrêt du conseil*), which, according to the state of the then existing constitution, had the force of a law, by which every man was forbidden to print or cause to be printed anything whatever upon administrative affairs, or government regulations in general, under the penalty of a breach of the police laws, by which the man was liable to be punished without defence, and not as was the case before the law-courts, where he might defend himself and could only be judged according to law. Morellet was desirous of publishing some modest objections against this decree, but his paper was obliged first to be sent to L'Averdy, in order that he might have permission so to do; this the controller refused to give, by a remark on the margin, which we shall give word for word in a note, and especially because the composition has such a singular resemblance to the style and the insolent tone in which the decree-writing jurists in Germany are often accustomed to speak even in our chambers*. This despotic time of L'Averdy and Du Terray was again followed by a period of excitement for the philosophic reformation of the existing state of things, which was brought about by the authorities themselves. Only two years after this coarse and offensive remark of L'Averdy, Malesherbes caused Morellet to translate into French Beccaria's work ('*Dei Delitti e delle Pene*') upon the philanthropic improvement of the criminal legislation of the middle ages, the torturing executions of the emperor Charles the Fifth, and the cannibal justice of the French parliaments; and ten years afterwards the ministry caused a whole flood of writings to be poured out. This translation of Morellet's went through seven editions in six months; and nothing can be a clearer proof how blind these people were, who, without the dreadful scenes of the revolution and in despite of all the requirements of the age, would have held fast everything old under a new form, than that these solidly learned but barbarian jurists of the parliaments did not in the slightest degree alter their mode of administering justice till their final dissolution, although Beccaria's system had been so joyfully greeted seven years before that event.

* The words are:—"Pour parler d'administration, il faut tenir la queue de la poêle, être dans la bouteille à l'encre et que ce n'est pas à un écrivain obscur, qui n'a pas cent écus vaillant, à endoctriner les gens en place."

In the year 1769 there was a wish, in accordance with the new principles, to abolish the East India Company, a kind of privileged trading society. The opponents of the Company had also in this case Necker against them, who had already begun to contest the principles of Turgot and Morellet's writings; and the controller, D'Invaux, again had recourse to the pen of Morellet as his champion. In this cause the controversy was carried on wholly by papers, as in constitutional states; one portion of the court took part with Necker, another with the controller, who, according to what is now the usual practice, communicated all the official documents to his advocate. In the following year (1770) Choiseul and Trudaine employed his pen, in the sense of the economical system, in order to write in opposition to Galiani's celebrated paper upon the corn trade ('Dialogue sur les Commerces des Blés,') and in favour of full freedom in this branch of commerce.

The historical and political importance of Turgot's system, when he became minister, will be obvious from these remarks upon the connexion of the system of political economy with the public discussion of matters concerning the rights and policy of nations, and concerning finance, by men of philosophic minds, who were not officials, but who were in some measure the representatives of the intelligence of their age during the darkest and the hardest times. From this moment forward it became impossible for a man who was only trained in practice and by practice, without theory and without the assistance of writers, to steer the ship of the state, which was endangered on all sides by the ignorance of his cabinet. Turgot was followed by Necker, and when he was removed, Joly de Fleury and D'Ormesson were unable to carry on the government with the old wisdom of parliamentary councils, and, in the person of Calonne, were obliged to choose a man who could defend his cause with an easy flowing language and with a skilful pen, if it were only upon fallacious grounds. This compels us once more, on account of the political history, to return to Turgot's system, because Necker had passed over from affairs of trade and banking to the administration of the state, and as a writer and director of the ministry defended and exercised quite a different theory and practice from those of Turgot.

Turgot as intendant, or as we should say as civil governor of the county of Limoges, had an opportunity of applying his prin-

ciples to a certain limited district, and especially that part of his system which he had drawn from the works of Quesnay, and proving the utility and advantage of the new system of administration proposed by him. We have already remarked that the numerous documents which refer to his administration of Limousin not only show what he afterwards wished to accomplish as minister in France, but may be also regarded as the manual of his whole economical system. One portion of these documents has been published in the present century by Dupont, viz. his circulars to his deputy intendants, to the commissioners of customs, to the officers of police, to the municipal councils, and to the clergy of his district; and under the reign of Napoleon these were all practically applied by Dupont, as well as by other noble and honourable public administrators who resembled him. Another portion comprehends various opinions delivered in the council of state (*avis au conseil*), and these have another description of importance and value, namely an historical one. From these various documents we learn the dreadful inequalities of the whole system of duties which were then imposed, and which he brings conspicuously forward and explains, to make obvious even to the king the urgent necessity of a thorough reformation to avoid a violent disruption of all the bonds of the state. He therefore proposes a better allotment and division of the chief duties, and insists especially upon a point which up to this day is neglected in many districts of France. He calls attention to the fact, that by far too little care was bestowed upon the proper culture of the soil, and that no heed was given to the great extent to which the peasantry was diminished, of which also we hear at present so many complaints. Much indeed of what he complains of has been swept away by the revolution, and among these evils villainage and tithes, whose disadvantageous influence in old France may be best learned by consulting Turgot's representations and opinions. The relation between the old system of large possessions and of the indivisibility of estates, and the breaking of them up and apportionment into small allotments, may be learned in like manner from his reports, founded on experience in Limoges, with respect to the difference of cultivation in the case of greater and smaller estates.

Turgot lived only for the benefit of those who were committed to his care; he felt how beneficial his system was to Limousin,

and refused the more important intendancies which were offered him in Rouen, Lyons and other places, because he wished to see the fruit of what he had sown. He is indeed reckoned among the philosophers and encyclopædists, but he was in all respects immeasurably removed from that heaven-storming audaciousness of which many of these men were properly accused. As a practical and admirable magistrate, he was too well aware of the advantage of that religious and moral feeling which is nourished by an intelligible worship, to imagine that the happiness of the people could be based on any other foundation than religion. Like Condorcet, he showed the greatest repugnance towards the ungodly, aristocratic, egoistical philosophy of Helvetius, and as much respect for the institutions of the catholic church and its really worthy pastors, as disinclination towards fanaticism, jesuitism, and popery. Those who wish to form an opinion of the merits of Turgot and the other political economists in reforming the whole administration of France, and to learn how far they were still behind their age in France at the time of the seven years' war, have only to turn over the first volume of Turgot's writings, published in nine volumes. The essential contents and the relation of the documents printed in the following parts to the administrative duties of his office are contained in this volume.

Turgot no sooner became minister, than he employed Morellet in order to place his ideas before the public in the dress of ornamental language, and to defend himself against the mad attacks of the defenders of everything old and of all prejudices, for he was noble enough not to wish to put down his opponents by power, but rather to convince them by reason. The question upon trade in corn, upon obstructions from without, upon hinderances in the free intercourse of one province with another, came first for public discussion. On this occasion the advocate Linguet entered the field, a man who enjoyed so high a reputation and so great celebrity when he was eighty years old, that even the emperor Joseph the Second availed himself of his talents against Turgot. He was however easily confuted, because his rhetorical language was mere declamation, and it was clear that he troubled himself nothing about truth or right, but only sought for paradoxes in order to show his skill in sophistry. He exhibited the first proof of his skill as an advocate, from which he derived his reputation, in the defences which he wrote of the

Duke d'Aiguillon and the Count de Morangies, before he became known by his manifold adventures; in the controversy upon the trade in corn he also took the part of the friends of the old system. It is impossible to obtain a better knowledge of the abuses to which rhetorical writing was then applied, and the length to which it was carried out in France, than by reading Linguet's silly papers against bread and bread-corn, and incidentally against freedom of trade. He persecuted the members of the academy and the encyclopædists with a wild and raving hate, and attacked their stalking-horse in order merely to be able to speak evil of themselves.

It would be very easy to confute such an antagonist as Linguet; but Necker also came forward as an opponent of Turgot's theory. He was then the central point of a splendid circle, who assembled at the house of his wife, and which was delighted that a man whose reputation was as great as that of the economists in Paris was willing to defend their opinion and their advantage against the minister. Proud of their applause, in his work upon Legislation in reference to Corn, and upon the Corn Trade in General, he defended a system which was directly opposed to that which had been proposed by Turgot, and tried to refute the reasons upon which his opinion was founded. The publication excited great attention, and Turgot, like all systematizers and doctrinaires, among the rest therefore Necker, showed himself too much prepossessed in his own favour by rudely refusing to discuss the contents of the work with Necker before it was sent to the press. He summoned Morellet anew to his aid, and caused him to compose a refutation of Necker.

This controversy, which was carried on between the two ministers, Turgot and Necker, derives a particular historical importance from the fact, that both, but in very different ways, were opposed to the existing order of things, because it appeared to them untenable, that each of them represented a certain party and opinion among those who demanded reform, and that in a time of absolute rule a public disputation was carried on by themselves and their friends in printed papers, like a debate in a chamber of deputies. Necker was at that time still a private man, but he was a banker of reputation, who not only was well acquainted with the theory of trade, but had also had great experience, and was therefore a considerable authority. Morellet acknowledges this, and accuses Necker of what the Genevese, on ac-

count of the extent to which they push their doctrinaire opinions, of their self-sufficiency and their pompous language, have been often accused. He says, namely, of Necker's thick book, that it contained a great many words and phrases, but that all its talk led, at last, to a very insignificant result. Morellet therefore only gave his book the title of a review of Necker's publication ('Analyse de l'ouvrage de la Législation et du Commerce des Blés').

We should now speak of some others, of Mirabeau, Beaumarchais, Brissot, La Clos, or more correctly De la Close, Louvet, Condorcet, Madame Roland and others, but these belong to the revolution, and we can only refer to them at a later period.

CHAPTER III.

GERMAN LITERATURE, IN RELATION TO PUBLIC AND DOMESTIC LIFE, TO THE TONE OF SOCIETY, AND PREVAILING CUSTOMS.

§ I.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY IN THE GERMAN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES, TILL THE INTRODUCTION OF KANT'S PHILOSOPHY INTO TWO GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

A. PHILOSOPHY.

THE history of the modern philosophy of Germany as a science does not belong to a work whose object is the mere statement of the phenomena of the time, and it would be presumption on the part of the author to wish to become a guide in a territory with which he is by no means unacquainted, but upon which every man, who is not indigenious, must always enter with a feeling of solemn apprehension. He therefore remains fast to his purpose of speaking only of manifestations and effects; and to this purpose it belongs to point out the course which public instruction in philosophy took, till the time in which Kant was

acknowledged among the learned, in a country in which, in the eighteenth century, all the educated men of the higher classes, and all the higher education of the whole nation proceeded from the learned schools, from the universities and from their chairs, and in which the whole literature was dependent upon the philosophy of the schools. In order not to lose ourselves in the history of literature, or to weary our readers by treating the subject at too great length, we shall not speak of all the philosophers and of all the universities, but select a few, leaving it to the reader to follow up the inquiry in the manner here pointed out, and to test the accuracy of what is herein alleged. This will be easily done by any one who wishes to enter more deeply into the subject than the author of a general work finds it necessary to do, whose object is not to test and thoroughly examine each system individually, but only to point out the way. According to this view, we think our end will be fully answered by directing the attention of our readers to Leipzig, Halle, Jena, Frankfort on the Oder, and Göttingen. Wolf, with whom we shall commence, was a professor in Marburg. From thence he was called a second time to Halle by Frederick the Second, but he never afterwards found so great and splendid an auditory as he had had before the Pietists and the word of command of Frederick William banished him from thence like a common felon. His philosophy however had gone forth, and was prevailing in the whole of Germany. His mathematical philosophy, composed in barbarous Latin and contained in no inconsiderable number of thick quartos, which demonstrated and defended everything possible in all sciences and all departments, was universally circulated, taught from all chairs, and preached in connexion with dogmatics from every pulpit. Wolf had only one opponent of consequence in Germany, Crusius in Leipzig, who was a close adherent to the scholastic system. The latter was a deep thinker and keen logician, which, as is well known, is quite consistent with limited views, because he was very consequent in his system, and Kant eagerly desired that every one should first study Crusius' logic and metaphysics before they entered upon his works, which were written directly in opposition to what was ancient.

Although Wolf, as a professor, even in the last period had very little influence, yet he was still alive, and the philosophy of Leibnitz, in itself able, but which had been reduced by his compends

and manuals to a system of pedantry, was still taught by the two Baumgartens. The one of these Baumgartens was in Halle, and there oracularly propounded the theological philosophy of Wolf or Leibnitz, in opposition to which Crusius taught his scholastic system in Leipzig; the other, Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, by his reputation attracted a great crowd of students to Frankfort on the Oder. He was distinguished for his style of delivery, and Nicolai, who at that time was learning the business of a bookseller and was an occasional hearer, says that, with the exception of Platner, he had never heard any man who was to be compared with him. He is the well-known inventor of a new philosophical science, *Æsthetics*, which was afterwards transplanted to Berlin by his disciple Schulzer, who was regarded by some of the ablest men of the time, by Ramler, Gleim, Kleist, &c. as the oracle of the fine arts in Germany. The latter Baumgarten was a practical philosopher, and for that reason was more profitable to German life (which for the most part was as far removed from all philosophy as German philosophy is almost always removed from life,) than the subtle theological Halle Baumgarten. From the Frankfort school sprung the moral-theologian Töllner and the bookseller Nicolai, who ventured to make his rough sound understanding a judge in speculative philosophy, as well as in other things which lay altogether beyond his circle. He justified his abuse of Kant in a dull book*, and defended himself by declaring that he had read Baumgarten's manuscript lectures and questioned his scholars, and at the same time had studied Wolf's German writings. Baumgarten attracted so many students to Frankfort, that at the close of the seven years' war, in which the town had suffered severely, the burgomaster applied to king Frederick to appoint another such philosopher as Baumgarten to a professorship, as a compensation for the injuries which the town had sustained. Frederick referred the matter to Guichard (Quintus Icilius), who appeared to be the most suitable person to give advice with respect to the calling of a Wolfian philosopher, inasmuch as he himself was a disciple and admirer of the system. Guichard immediately recommended a man, who, although he departed in

* 'Of my learned Education, my Knowledge of Critical Philosophy, and my Writings relating to the same, and of Messrs. Kant, J. B. Erhard, and Fichte; by Fred. Nicolai. An Appendix to the late Conversation between Christian Wolf and a Kantian.' Berlin, 1799.

some essential points from the theory and principles of Wolf, was yet at that time regarded as the best teacher of philosophy in Germany. This was Darjes, who was in consequence called from Jena to Frankfort, under the most advantageous conditions. Darjes had been originally educated in Rostock in the philosophy of a scholastic Lutheranism, but he had early removed to Jena, where Carpov made him a fanatical partisan of the theory of Wolf. What Darjes has said of his philosophical blindness at the time of his first conversion to Wolf's system, is of no small importance for the German nation, because in Germany in particular, almost every time a new direction in philosophy or theology is taken, a new head of a sect appears, or a new school is formed, a multitude of followers at once adopt and devote themselves to the new philosophical or theological prophets with blind zeal and madness.

Darjes admits that, as soon as he felt himself strong in the Wolfian method of definition and demonstration, although unacquainted with the world, without having studied the ancients, without knowledge of any of the physical sciences, with an incredible presumption, he felt himself, on his airy elevation, superior to all the world. We shall quote his words in a note, in order to show that Nicolai, who praises the followers of Wolf, but complains bitterly of the assumptions of those of Kant, of Fichte and others, ought rather to have accused human nature, and particularly the nature of the German universities*. This was about the year 1735, and Darjes exposed himself to a formal prosecution on account of his Wolfian boldness with the theologians, who stood at that time as a sort of police over philosophy, to which honourable office they begin again to make claims; and because, as is well known, nothing is to be done with theologians, he turned his philosophy to jurisprudence. He taught moral philosophy and the laws of nature in Jena till 1763, whilst Baumgarten in Halle and Crusius in Leipzig were philosophizing in a theological fashion. He soon gave up demon-

* As the same things occur among us almost every ten years, we shall here set down the words of Darjes. He says;—"Whoever said anything to me against the principles of Wolf, he was my enemy, and in my heart I regarded him as a man of feeble understanding. I was more prudent than others; I could delineate other teachers by an easy turn of speech, and whoever did not teach as Wolf taught, was in my eyes contemptible. I could also abuse admirably. I only failed in one quality, of a philosophical champion. I could not speak evil of others in their absence. I could not describe their doctrines, behind their backs, so as to injure them," &c.

stration, and was among the very first in Germany who wished to labour through philosophy for the promotion of the social interests of life, rather than to form sects and schools, which indeed at a later period proved injurious to science, till Kant helped to restore it to its proper station and rights.

The attention which Wolf excited in the whole of Germany in the time of Frederick William the First, as well as the career which Darjes ran in Jena, are remarkable facts in for the history of the German nation. Darjes' lectures upon natural rights especially attracted many students, and he had almost as many auditors in the little town of Jena as he could have had in Paris. From four to five hundred was a usual number, and as the largest lecture-rooms were insufficient to contain the numbers who crowded to hear him, in summer the stairs were thronged, and ladders were placed by the windows in order to secure some hearing-place however inconvenient. When he removed to Frankfort as the successor of Baumgarten, he continued as a jurist to be heard with pleasure by numerous classes of students till his death in 1792; but philosophy properly so called had been cultivated in Germany since the end of the seven years' war rather as a study for self-gratification than as a science, except by Crusius in Leipzig alone. This was greatly to the advantage of German literature, of life, and of style; but the investigation of the inward nature of man, and of the relations of the powers of thinking and willing to the necessities of his condition, made no progress.

Writers upon *belles-lettres*, such as F. H. Jacobi and Herder, had for some time complete possession of the department of philosophy, which had become benumbed in the universities. Lessing and Mendelssohn, although men of deep and solid learning, believed, and with justice, that the call to waken and rouse up a nation from the slumber of the middle ages, was greater than that of creating a mere system of philosophy for schools and professors. Like the English and French, they thought by means of philosophy to throw some light upon the dark religion of the age, without at the same time doing homage to the fashionable theories of the French academicians. They attempted to do for Germany what their contemporary David Hume had done for England, and proved at the same time that it was quite possible to clothe deep and earnest thoughts in the German language, without using unintelligible and barbarous dialects.

Mendelssohn was indeed somewhat more dogmatic on the subject than a philosopher who had properly no system can well be permitted to be. He attempted to demonstrate the personal continuance of men after death, but since all that pertains to a future world can only be a matter of faith, and not of demonstration, the question is made easy to pulpit orators, who have only to satisfy those who bring the necessary faith along with them to the church. Mendelssohn therefore, without wishing or knowing it, ventured into the province of religion.

The arbitrary combination of all sorts of principles and doctrines, selected from all sorts of systems, from the ancients, from sermons and catechisms, and also sometimes from the most celebrated French writers of the new school,—in short, thoughts borrowed by good fortune, or suggested by the conversation of the day,—this method of aggregation which prevailed in all the professorial chairs about 1780, was called in Germany the Eclectic philosophy. This kind of philosophy was so much in estimation after the seven years' war, that the estimable Feder, who was one of the most highly respected men in Germany in his day, was called to Göttingen in 1768 expressly for the purpose of bringing forward and teaching moral and popular philosophy, as it was called, in that university. And when we speak of Göttingen, Feder alone can be referred to, for Meiner scarcely deserves to be mentioned, because his lectures, which almost no one would have attended if they had not been free, were very much worse than even his miserable printed compilations, from which he read them word for word. The author can testify this from his own experience, because he had the patience, without being absent from a single lecture, to listen to him drawling out word for word from his written brief, for a whole semester.

When Feder went to Göttingen in 1768, which at that time, and for twenty years afterwards, was the university of the princes, nobility, and of the jurists of the first rank, who then governed Germany, philosophy was wholly prostrate, not merely because it had fallen into disrepute, and that with good reason, both in Hanover and London, but also accidentally. Hollman was old, and could scarcely be named among philosophers, however much valuable knowledge he possessed; the Crusian Weber was looked upon with contempt; Becmann, who was an adherent of Wolf's system, found no auditory; Feder therefore

wished to follow Darjes' example, who was then delighting the jurists in Frankfort, as he had formerly done in Jena. When he began his lectures, he wished to adopt Darjes' theory of morals as his basis; but it was soon intimated to him, in a manner characteristic of Göttingen and Hanover, that it was *infra dignitatem* in so renowned a university for a professor to adopt a compend as the basis of his lectures, which had not been written in Göttingen. Feder was therefore obliged to stand upon his own feet, and by teaching in a similar manner at first, ran a similar career to that of Darjes; but when the author of this work became acquainted with him, after the time of Kant, every trace of popularity had altogether disappeared; Feder, as well as Darjes, was obliged for some years to read with open doors, the vestibule was crowded with eager listeners, and many were obliged to go away without being able to come within hearing-distance of the professor.

The philosophy which was taught by Feder in Göttingen, by Darjes in Frankfort, and by Eberhardt, who was somewhat later invited to Halle, corresponded completely with what Rousseau called philosophy, with Basedow's fancies of moral training and education, with Salzmann and Campe's hot-house precocious wisdom, and with their literature of education. The instruction then universally given and called philosophy, was completely suited to the prose of everyday life. Every one was able to follow these practical philosophers, and their obvious palpable wisdom, directed merely to the minds and affairs of common life, and nothing can well be further from poetry than practical jurisprudence and German life. It will therefore be readily seen why active professional men and good Prussians, like Nicolai, should have raged almost to madness against the new poetry and philosophy. These people, who felt themselves so well off in their shops, in their offices, in their common-place official life, could not comprehend why that which was so very satisfactory to the jurists should not satisfy the minds of others. In this way philosophy sank wholly into disrepute; the only deep thinker among its professors, Crusius, was a theological grub; he made himself in the highest degree ridiculous in the case of Schröpfer's impostures, which he explained from his theory of the devil and of evil spirits, and no one suspected in the sixth, seventh, and eighth decennium of the eighteenth century, that in the ninth an entirely new philosophy was to spring up in

Königsberg, and to spread over the whole of Germany. But precisely at this time, Kant, without attracting observation, founded his new theory; for he had been a public teacher in Königsberg from 1753. We are not merely indebted to him for a new scientific philosophy, but also for the most distinguished portions of the poetry of Schiller and Göthe.

Kant and Hegel are the only men among our German creators of philosophic systems, who had for years devoted themselves to the thorough examination of their speculations in the study, before they excited attention from the chair or as writers, and who only succeeded late in life in securing public attention. All the others, as young men, immediately stood upon a dangerous elevation, and were intoxicated with an immense self-confidence, which was the result of the empty and confounding vapour of applause bestowed upon them by other young men who were both easily won and easily deceived. When Kant appeared as a teacher in Königsberg, in 1753, he devoted his time chiefly to the study of Hume's philosophical writings; and this profound thinker, by his solid and cautious scepticism, awakened doubts in his mind upon the tenableness of the whole system of metaphysics, which had been universally dogmatically taught since the time of Aristotle. In the 'Letters upon Literature,' therefore, the attention of the Germans, who were at that time anxiously looking for deliverance from every kind of barbarism, and hoping for an entirely new æra in science and literature, was directed to him. The announcement founded upon his short treatises in the sixth and seventh decennia, was, that he was born to be a reformer of German philosophy. In his correspondence with Lambert, well known as a mathematician and profound thinker, he had expressed the opinion, as early as 1762, that all the systems of philosophy which had previously existed were mere vapour and sophistry, and that there was only one way of arriving at a system of metaphysics, which should satisfy the demands of reason more fully than the hitherto existing systems had done. In a Latin dissertation which appeared in 1767 ('De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis'), he had already laid down the principles according to which he proposed to proceed; he explained himself, however, more fully with respect to his system in his lectures only, without publishing any thing in the German language upon the subject.

In this manner the proper philosophy of Kant was disseminated

for many years, by the same means alone by which the Greek philosophers founded schools. Kant's more immediate friends and his auditors were the initiated and the apostles of the new gospel. These consisted for the most part of men such as Scheffner, Hippel, Hamann, and others, who without being as celebrated as some others were yet well known in Germany as men who, by severe criticism and by zeal against the French taste which proceeded from Berlin, were desirous of maintaining an earnestness in the new literature of the Germans. They therefore awakened great expectations in the minds of their friends; and there was the greater disposition in the public mind to place confidence in the Königsberg friends of the philosopher, as they were neither properly speaking followers of Kant, philosophers by profession, nor wished to be so regarded.

Hippel, when he had given up theology and returned a second time to the university to study law, attended Kant's lectures and enjoyed his intimate converse; but he never told him of his purpose of communicating his philosophy to the world, without his permission or without even mentioning his name. This, however, Hippel did, in his singular novel, humorously called 'The Career of Life in ascending Gradations,' and also in his short treatise upon marriage. The first volumes of 'The Career of Life' appeared some considerable time before Kant published his 'Criticism of Pure Reason.' In this book there is found not merely indications or results of the new philosophy, but whole passages which agree word for word with passages in the 'Criticism of Pure Reason.' In this manner Hippel not only prepared the way for Kant's 'Criticism,' but, if we would express a severer judgement, he robbed him of the contents of his philosophical works, brought them before the public, and thereby, as his manner was, gave rise to another error, which increased the fame of his talents as a novel-writer, and, because his works were widely circulated and generally read, he contributed to advance Kant's reputation. Because Hippel, from egoistical views, did not acknowledge himself as the author of these works during the life of Frederick the Second, it has been alleged that there were several contributors to them, and among the rest Kant. After Hippel's death this led to an explanation December 6th, 1796), in which Kant gives a full account of the connexion of his writings with Hippel's books, which were at that time almost

universally read in the Baltic provinces, in Prussia proper, and in North Germany.

“It is indeed true,” he observes, “that there are many passages in Hippel’s works which altogether correspond with passages in my treatises upon Pure Reason, which were published at a later period; this however is to be explained by the fact, that I only first completed my whole system between 1770 and 1780, but in this interval had explained and elucidated many portions of it as fragments to my hearers. Hippel availed himself of his notes and of my written lectures upon logic, moral philosophy, and natural rights, but particularly upon anthropology, without ever having mentioned in conversation his intention of using them as his own writings.” We see some evidence of Kant’s influence at an earlier period in Schiller’s correspondence with Göthe. Schiller directs Göthe’s attention to a treatise of Kant’s which had appeared in 1771, (*‘Observations upon the Sublime and Beautiful,’*) not merely in reference to the foundation of a new system of æsthetics which it contained, but also with respect to many hints which are there given upon man and the nature of the human mind. Kant’s chief work, the *‘Criticism of Pure Reason,’* appeared in 1781, and raised the general expectation, that after German prose and poetry, education and school instruction, theology and political economy had been each successively reformed, the turn of philosophy, which had altogether degenerated and sunk in the last decennia, had now also arrived.

Kant’s work awakened no newspaper alarm; it did not even excite as much attention as a drama, an opera, or a new novel was accustomed to do; it was therefore at first very little in demand. Even the few persons who were acquainted with the subject received it with quiet and reserved respect. The public attention was roused by Nicolai, who afterwards made himself so ridiculous by the war which he begun and carried on with the new philosophy, that he not only brought himself into disrepute, but destroyed all feeling of respect for the *‘Universal German Library.’* It was nevertheless Nicolai who first declared, in his journal, that no such important work upon philosophy had appeared since the days of Aristotle. At first no antagonists presented themselves, because the occupiers of the philosophical chairs, as is common in such cases, found it easier, in their self-importance, to be or to seem to be ignorant of the book,

than to refute or even to understand it. The few who ventured to attack the new system lost the name and reputation of talent, because Kant very easily and palpably proved to them that they had entirely misunderstood him, and had been fighting with windmills. Feder in Göttingen, who had hitherto enjoyed that esteem as a philosopher which he fully merited as a man, suddenly lost all his reputation, not only in the learned world, but even among the students, by a review in the Göttingen 'Notices,' in which he proved plainly enough that he had neither thoroughly studied Hume, Kant, nor Aristotle. Kant therefore was besought on all sides to explain and elucidate, at least to the learned, the study of his system, and the mode of penetrating and understanding the spirit of his work. With this view, in 1783, he wrote 'Prolegomena to all future systems of Metaphysics which claim to be regarded as scientific' (222 pp. 8vo.). In this work his object is to expound the contents and intention of his 'Criticism of Pure Reason' more fully, definitively and intelligibly to his readers than had been previously done in the work itself; and in order to do this with greater success, he reduces the matter treated of in his work to a few questions. He says, that the question of the possibility of metaphysics, which it was his object in his great work to resolve, may be comprehended in general in a short question, which may be resolved into four other questions. The short and main question is, 'How are synthetic propositions *a priori* possible?' The four other questions are, 'How is pure mathematics possible?' 'How is a science of nature possible?' 'How is metaphysics in general possible?' 'How is metaphysics as a science possible?' It will immediately be seen from this manner of conceiving and stating the subject, that at a time in which people were only accustomed to popular philosophy or to agreeable small-talk and parlour conversation upon philosophy, even this book could scarcely drive on the men who devoted themselves to this department of study to endeavour to master the scientific system of a consequent thinker, because the French and the tone-giving Berliners, who were half French, were hostile to every abstract thinker. Königsberg lay too remote for the youth who afterwards assembled in Jena, and made Reinhold, Fichte and Schelling successively, each in his way, a university meteor; and very few went to Königsberg in order to become apostles of the new theory.

Under these circumstances, Kant's philosophy still remained fruitless after the publication of the first two announcements of it, till one of his Königsberg disciples resolved, under the eye of the author, and strictly after his suggestions, to compose a work for the public in such a style that universal attention should be called to the new philosophy, and the study of it considerably facilitated. Schulze, court preacher in Königsberg, undertook the task, and fully accomplished his object. In 1784, he published a book of 254 pages, under the title, 'Elucidations of Professor Kant's Criticism of Pure Reason.' The consequence was an immediate demand for the work, and a great many in all parts of Germany professed themselves friends and followers of the author. After that time Kant's philosophy became the fashion, in the same way as Hegel's after he was called from Heidelberg to Berlin; but in both cases the words of Holy Writ were soon verified which allege, with respect to every species of knowledge which should lead to a life in God, or holiness of mind, that "many are called, but few chosen." The study of the new philosophy was suddenly universally pursued, but because there is among us so much pedantic or small-townish and uncouth writing, this study often led to great silliness, and made us ridiculous in the eyes of the English and the French, for neither of them could read or understand the master, and could rarely find out anything that was good among the almost incalculable mass of writings of his disciples. No work of science, from that of mineralogy and petrification to astronomy, was any more to be seen in the book-shops without the Kantian terminology; for the book-manufacturers knew nothing more of the philosophy, or if they did, neither the speculation nor the book had any chance of success.

This result was first seen, when Carl Gottfried Reinhold, formerly an able disciple of the Vienna Jesuits, who had become a protestant and found occupation and protection in Weimar, fully accomplished what Schulze had begun; and, as it appears from the correspondence between Reinhold and Kant, the work was done very much to the satisfaction of the latter. Schulze's work, considered in and for itself, was of very small importance; it was wholly a subordinate affair, however profitable it might have been to those who interested themselves about philosophy, although no proficients at least wished to read the new and celebrated book which was everywhere spoken of. It contains

merely a notice of the contents of the 'Criticism,' an explanation of the terminology, and a number of single hints and elucidations which Kant himself had suggested to the writer. Reinhold viewed the matter differently, but subsequently to the year 1786; and as we consider this year and the following ones as the limits of the events to be related in this volume, we shall allude to Reinhold hereafter in connexion with Fichte and Schelling; we must now however point out the manner in which Jena became the chief seat of the Kantian philosophy.

At the very time in which Schulze tried to make Kant accessible to the great German public, when hypocrites and the willing crouching dependents of the mistress of Frederick William the Second, who had gained great influence, guided the Prussian press, a freer criticism was established in Jena than would at that time have been possible in Berlin. This was very favourable to Kant; because Nicolai, as the sovereign of the Berlin criticism, like the Prussians in general, were completely hostile to innovations. Nicolai and the criticism of the 'Universal German Library,' which was wholly and peculiarly under his direction, as well as the 'Jena Literary Journal' afterwards, had a decisive position and influence in literature, which are to us at the present day incomprehensible. These periodicals decided the reputation of writers without contradiction or appeal. Nicolai was placed in a double dilemma, between Scylla and Charybdis: on the one hand, Wöllner, Bichofswerder, and the whole mass of the pious under the leading of the Countess of Lichtenau and other powerful persons of the same caste, would no longer endure the new light of the time of Frederick the Second, which Nicolai and his friends, with an honourable and commendable zeal for literature, vigorously defended: on the other hand, the 'Universal Jena Literary Journal' threatened innovations to which the rude and boisterous Nicolai offered the strongest opposition. He finally fell under the attacks of both enemies. Both these literary tribunals, the Berlin and the Jena, cast in their lot with the destiny of Kant's philosophy; they threw the notices of Schulze's book into the scale of fate, and Nicolai when weighed was found wanting.

'The Universal German Library,' without attempting to undervalue the great importance and worth of Kant's 'Criticism,' took advantage of the opportunity afforded by the publication of Schulze's short work to defend the old philosophy under the

appearance of writing to facilitate the understanding of the new. This was the signal for the German public to declare that Nicolai's tribunal was antiquated and uncalled for, as being under the direction of incapable judges, who were behind the spirit of the age. The new 'Jena Literary Journal,' on the contrary, did not so much properly write a review of Schulze's book, as avail itself of the occasion to introduce into their July number of the year 1785 a treatise upon the new philosophy, which of itself would have made a complete and not very thin volume. This was very good university policy, and the consequence was that the Journal immediately gained reputation and the university also. In Weimar the new philosophy found a vehement opponent in Herder; Göthe however had not then reached his subsequent courtliness of nature, but greeted in the most friendly manner every new manifestation of the age, every free movement, and appropriated to himself whatever served his poetical objects. Wieland was a friend and promoter of the new philosophy on account of the interests and participation of his son-in-law.

Reinhold, Wieland's son-in-law, had begun to study the 'Criticism of Pure Reason' in the autumn of 1785, and published the result of his studies, a defence and explanation of the new philosophy, in the form of letters, which produced a great influence upon the public mind. These letters first appeared in Wieland's 'Mercury,' which was very extensively circulated, and were afterwards published as a separate book. After this publication, in August 1786, Reinhold was called in the following year, as professor, to Jena, and this university from that time forward became the source from which philosophy, æsthetics and critical examinations of the Bible flowed over all Germany. The lectures of the new professor of the new philosophy were opened at Michaelmas, 1787, and were attended by an unexampled concourse of students. This concourse was the greater as Jena was the only seat of the victorious philosophy, which it was afterwards attempted in vain to settle and naturalize in Kiel, by the invitation of Reinhold to that university. The chiefs of the German schools and occupiers of chairs, who were distinguished men in their way, Platner in Leipzig, Garve in Breslau, Tiedemann in Marburg, and Feder in Göttingen, from this time forth were held as of no account; and every philosophical writing was obliged to wear the Kantian colours.

B. THEOLOGY.

We have placed the view of the progress of philosophy before that of theological development and enlightenment in protestant Germany (for of protestant Germany we can alone speak, as positive limits are placed to philosophy and theology among catholics), because religious faith among the German protestants, even the faith of the people, has been always, and continues to the present day to be, intimately bound up with the prevailing philosophy. Luther and Calvin were as adverse to the scholasticism of the middle ages as to popery itself; their earliest followers were like minded. But as soon as the philosophy of the German universities again became scholastic, at the end of the sixteenth century, theology also again assumed a scholastic character; whole folios were filled with the dogmatics of a single gospel, in which an impartial and unbiassed reader can perceive no trace of dogmatics at all. Leibnitz knew mankind, as Göthe also knew it, and he was in his way great like him; but he too wished to be all things to all men, and consequently on the one hand he announced and explained the full sense of his doctrines to the few who were deeply learned in mathematical science, in his celebrated treatise, ‘*De ipsa natura, seu de vi insita actionibusque creaturarum, pro dynamicis suis confirmandis illustrandisque*’ (Acta Erudit. ann. 1698). On the other hand, he wrote his ‘*Theodice*’ especially for the benefit of the polite and the theological world, in short for all those who might be called *exoterii*, in which he cast his philosophy into a dogmatical form, and arranged it for the use of the professor’s chair and the pulpit. In this work he showed both catholics and protestants the way to deduce and to demonstrate all possible dogmas in an able manner and in a mathematical form, without having direct recourse to the old-fashioned scholastics or to Aristotle; he himself had attempted this with Transubstantiation and other such doctrines. This will surprise no one, since, as is well known, the doctrine of the Trinity, from the earliest times till the present day, has been the point on which men have attempted in the cleverest manner to unite the deepest speculations upon the nature of things and of the human mind.

Wolf, in his thick quartos, afterwards alloyed Leibnitz’s gold with such a mass of copper that it was made altogether fit to

serve as small change for academical and pulpit use. Baumgarten in Halle, however, went somewhat deeper as a theologian. After Baumgarten's time the Halle theology predominated; it condemned everything which was not altogether pietistic, which would not renounce thinking, and believe in the Wolfian philosophy, which was funnelled into the youth of the Orphan House in Halle. From the time of Wolf, the Leibnitz philosophy, diluted and popularized in books, schools and pulpits, universally prevailed, and religion was demonstrated according to Wolf's manner, till the 'Letters upon Literature,' Wieland, Lessing and others exposed the system, and turned the whole into ridicule. There immediately arose a vehement strife, which is universally the forerunner and signal of a new life, for rest belongs to mortals in the grave alone.

The Wolfian philosophy disappeared, or only showed itself, in a concealed form, as in Jerusalem's writings, and in works upon *belles-lettres*; and then arose in protestant theology a difference of views, which resulted from the different prevailing systems of the popular or eclectic philosophy. In the seventh decennium of the century, the rudest dogmatism of the sixteenth century was ruling in all the universities, whose nature, as Semler had proved, had been shown by Luther to be quite foreign to the Gospel, and Semler was regarded as a heretic. In Wittenberg, Rostock, Tübingen, Erfurt, and Altorf, all remained fast by the old ways; in Giessen, C. F. Bahrdt was only a short-lived phenomenon, and as long as Carpzov taught and ruled in Helmstadt, the beams of enlightenment found no admission, even those which, in Mosheim's manner, were scattered from Brunswick. At that time the abbot Jerusalem maintained in Germany the reputation of a great orator and of a Christian philosopher, because he was very anxious, and therefore took great pains, to write ornamentally. G. F. Sailer, in Erlangen, fell in more with the ruling taste than Carpzov, and sought eagerly for popularity, but they both stood upon the same level, with this difference only, that the former concerned himself with the more popular faith (in which the surest way is to hold fast by what is traditionary), in order to make the results of philosophy useful to the mass of the people. Crusius in Leipzig was at the same time a theologian and philosopher, and as the result of his investigations was able to demonstrate the

truth of both faith and superstition. His colleague Ernesti however had already thrown some new light upon the New Testament, as Michaelis, who was his contemporary, had done upon the Old.

Ernesti was a follower of Wolf, but, as a thinker and systematic philosopher, he could bear no comparison with his colleague Crusius. He could not therefore oppose him properly as a dogmatist, but had, on the other hand, gained a high reputation as being deeply learned in the classic languages, and as an admirable interpreter of the ancients. He prudently and cautiously proceeded to found a school of biblical theologians in Leipzig. His object was to apply his critical method of explaining the ancients, to the explanation of the meaning of the New Testament, and thus to shed the light of the eighteenth century over the benumbed and stiff theology of the time, without making any definite attack upon the existing dogmatics, or giving offence to the orthodox Lutheran Saxons. He announced, with timidity and caution, that the Scriptures must be explained like every other book; but he pushed this so far, that the explanation was always learned, but often very tasteless, which is by no means seldom the case with him even in his interpretations and criticism of Homer. But even this weakness and insufficiency were advantageous to the enlightenment and mental improvement of the school-teachers, who viewed antiquity with unbiassed eyes, and to that of the divines who wished to teach and preach intelligibly, because it brought science somewhat nearer to common life, which in Germany was in the highest degree empty and insipid.

Ernesti availed himself of his great renown as a philologist, in order to show the defects of the ancient methods of explaining the Scriptures, which prevailed at this time, although he neither could nor would establish anything new. He was a mere critic and interpreter of words, and in this respect was far inferior to Semler. Ernesti cannot be compared with Semler, because he set positive limits to his dogmatics and his inquiries, and even his convictions, in order not to break with the ruling system. He invented a system of artificial expressions, in order to keep the interpreter of the sacred books within the circle of the established faith, about which in other books no question can be raised. He called this the analogy of faith, or rule of faith, which is in truth nothing else than an obli-

gation to find in the Bible and to deduce from it every article of faith, which has at any time or for any reason been received into the authorized creeds. But even in Leipzig theologians did not remain quite true to the ancient faith, whilst Semler had established a school in Halle (1770), which treated the writings which have been received upon good grounds as genuine by the earliest teachers of the church, and the explanation of the narratives and letters attributed to the Evangelists and Apostles, in a very different way from that in which they were treated by Ernesti in Leipzig or Michaelis in Göttingen.

Semler afterwards became a most undeserved object of hatred both to the new school and the old. The adherents of the old system had abused and reprobated him as an innovator; and when he began to show himself zealous for the old belief, the spirit of the age had made such a rapid and astounding advance, that his views were disallowed also by the new generation, and his excessive zeal for orthodoxy was laid hold of by Bahrdt as a pretence to revile him as a fanatical visionary. In fact, he also wished to set limits, beyond which inquiries and examination into the sources of the doctrines of the church and of those doctrines themselves, should not be pushed. His opponents were undoubtedly wrong in both cases; for when complaints were made of his pretended sinful and doubt-seeking criticism, he was himself always anxious and fearful, lest he should promote anything sinful; and at a later period it must have been distressing to the aged man, to find Bahrdt and such men as he, and even the author of the *Wolfenbüttele Fragments* dealing with Christ and his Apostles as if they had been intentional impostors. Semler himself had critically and conscientiously examined almost all the individual doctrines of the old system of dogmatics, in separate treatises, which are only readable by the learned, for even the style of his autobiography is truly deterring. The result of the examination was, that they were found untenable, and this he loudly announced. This announcement had the greater effect, as the most distinguished and learned men of the time, even those of the Catholic church, had thankfully acknowledged his industry, his earnestness and his merits in reference to his criticism upon the sources of ecclesiastical history and dogmatics. By his criticism of the text of the New Testament, which Griesbach, following his steps, afterwards completed, as well as by his critical elucidation of the remains of the earliest

or apostolic fathers, which were regarded as the oldest memorials of the Christian church, he had besides shown how dangerous it was to place ecclesiastical traditions, and even the oldest histories of the early Christian societies, along with the Bible as a divine revelation. Such a declaration must have produced the greater influence, as he did not deny that an extraordinary measure of the divine spirit was vouchsafed to the early church, and inspiration to the teaching of the apostolic fathers.

He helped himself through this modestly propounded theory, by the supposition that God himself and his holy messengers had delivered the divine instructions to mankind in a manner suited to their weakness and their necessities; this he called accommodation. And he gave it as his opinion, that what had been suited and delivered definitely for one period, might be otherwise understood when that period was passed. On this principle a wide field was opened even to the investigations of believers, because Semler applied the principle also to the Bible itself. He declared without hesitation, that the Old Testament, as a Jewish religious book, was not to be explained from the New, which was Christian, and not in any respect to be used as a book of Christian religion. In this way Semler, by his incomparable learning, paved the way for the so-called Rationalists, to whom however he in no respect belonged, and who went much further than he contemplated. He proves beyond the possibility of contradiction, although some even yet venture to allege the contrary, that there was no determinate and uniform rule or form in the earliest ages of Christianity, either in reference to doctrine or to the constitution of the Christian church; and he added a proposition, which every man who has any pretensions to be acquainted with the history of the Christian church will in like manner admit. "In the midst of all apparent difference," he observes (and every man who understands the nature of Christianity will agree with the observation), "the nature of Christianity remained the same, because it did not by any means consist in an agreement about dogmas, but in a Christian life."

We would name Halle, rather than Jena or Göttingen, as the university in which still further steps than those which had been taken by Semler were taken to defend Christianity against the attacks of Bahrdt, Reimarus and Lessing, were it not that Eber-

hardt, whom we shall hereafter mention, only came to Halle in 1778, where, without obstacle or hinderance, he proclaimed a pure Deism for Christianity. Töllner, a follower of the Frankfort Baumgarten, and, like him, a professor in the same university, also made an attempt to bring the old church system into some sort of agreement with the new philosophy, because he too found the old faith incapable of being maintained. He scarcely ventured as far as Ernesti, and remained far behind Semler. Töllner had besides a method peculiar to himself, of promoting the progress of religious instruction in correspondence with the requirements of the age, and had hit upon a method of treating the protestant doctrines and their sources, by which he accomplished what neither Semler, Michaelis, nor Ernesti by their methods had succeeded in accomplishing. He viewed the subject on one hand philosophically, and on the other theologically, and thus placed himself in a situation philosophically to impugn what he wished theologically to maintain. In order to justify this plan, he alleged (and the allegation was indisputably well-founded,) that theology was neither capable of being mathematically demonstrated with Wolf, nor of being scholastically investigated with Crusius, but that it rested merely upon historical testimony, and that the whole question depended upon the fact, whether there was sufficient historical proof of divine testimony and interference. In this view, he took the divine inspiration of the Scriptures in a much stricter sense than Ernesti or Semler; and for that very reason, he proposed a strict exegetical and philosophical examination of all those doctrines, according to which the common ideas of the system of doctrine were deduced from Scripture, and afterwards proved with respect to many of them that they were not to be found there.

Töllner sought to establish a singular principle, in order at the same time to satisfy the demands of the age, and the still prevailing strictness of belief in the symbolical books. He taught, that the sense of the holy Scriptures is compounded of the sense of the author, which in many places was deficient and was always liable to philosophical criticism, and of the sense of the Holy Spirit, which was in all respects perfect, clear, just, certain, and living. These two might be often different, but could not be contradictory to each other, although the sense of the Holy Spirit might remain obscure or unknown to the author of the book whose instrumentality he employed. We must

not here go further into the subject, but shall only give some notices of the relation in which the earliest attempts at a reformation of the benumbed doctrinal theories, which were made in Halle, Leipzig, and Frankfort, by Semler, Ernesti and Töllner, stood to each other. We merely point out the fact which is obvious from what we have said concerning Töllner, that he remained far behind Ernesti and Semler, and in this case was more inconsequent than either.

As to the university of Göttingen, Michaelis was somewhat free in his interpretation, but in his dogmatics altogether orthodox. Moreover he gained his well-deserved reputation in Europe, not in a theological way, for he won the great applause which was showered upon him by a very profane exposition from his professorial chair. Whoever may have heard the manner in which in his lectures he introduced all possible things, sciences, and anecdotes into the explanation of the holy Scriptures,—whoever has read his Introduction to the Old and New Testament, and his work upon the Law of Moses, will not attach great value to his doctrinal religion: and yet we must still regard him in one point as having made no small advance in exegesis. A man who, like Michaelis, had written the books which have just been mentioned, could not possibly subscribe to the notion, which in our times begins again partially to prevail, that before the fall snakes walked on the end of their tails, or that Elijah was conveyed to heaven in a fiery chariot.

Mosheim was celebrated in Europe as a preacher and church historian contemporaneously with Michaelis as a theologian: he was however a cautious man of learning and an excellent writer in the Latin language. The thought of reform was as far from his mind, as from that of the profoundly learned Walch, who also devoted himself to learned ecclesiastical history. When Plank succeeded him, he opened his career with a work, which exposed the originators of the so-called symbolical books of the Protestants in all their nakedness. In his history of the origin and condition of the protestant ecclesiastical system of doctrine, Plank proved to every man's conviction, that the formulas of the protestant compends were forced upon them by means which were altogether as objectionable as those by which the decrees of councils were made laws by the Byzantine emperors, and that in both cases ambitious clergy, ministers, and princes, played a deep and hypocritical game. Spittler, who for some time after

co-operated with Plank, but who soon forsook a theological career, commenced by proving with great cleverness and learning, and that from the documents of the ancient churches, that matters were much worse with respect to the principles and history of the very earliest churches than Semler had thought it right to declare.

Nobody, besides, will be surprised that the new theology did not originate in Göttingen, for that would have been contrary to the dull but safe middle course of policy which was always the characteristic of Hanover. It would have been very unsatisfactory to the careful and watchful attention of king George the Third, who was in the highest degree orthodox; nor would Pütter, the ruling imperial publicist, who with Heyne was much favoured in Hanover, have allowed it to prevail. Pütter, as is well known, and as may be read in his Life, was prouder and more thoroughly convinced of the mighty influence of his 'Only Way to true Happiness,' and of his 'Christian Religion in its true Connexion,' than of the advantage of any of his numerous juristical opinions.

Michaelis was, therefore, quite a different man in his exegesis from what he was in his dogmatics, which surprised no one at that time. In dogmatics he remained firmly or professedly attached to the old system; whilst his colleague Heilmann, partly by his classic Latin, in which he wrote his dogmatics, and partly because he was a follower of Wolf and applied his philosophy to dogmatics, was obliged and permitted to throw some rays of light upon the thick darkness of the new scholasticism. Zachariä avoided ecclesiastical dogmatics altogether, which he saw attacked and shattered to pieces from all sides, and from dogmatism came back to the text of the Bible. He wrote a work upon biblical theology in five volumes, at the time when the tremendous attacks were made from Wolfenbuttle upon Christianity, and the documents in which it is contained, when Bahrdt was taken under the protection of Teller, when king Frederick the Second presented Eberhardt, who was persecuted by the orthodox, with a living, and afterwards made him a professor in Halle, at a time therefore in which every man regarded the old system as altogether untenable. In his work, Zachariä availed himself of the interpretations of those who sought to set aside what was unsound and non-essential, in order to be able to save the weighty and essential points of the Gospel.

He therefore mentioned many dogmatic subtleties, none of which he found in the Bible; and took cautious heed not to displease the adherents of the ancient belief.

The German universities first completely altered their method of theological teaching, when the theologians and philosophers in Jena, who gave the tone to the public mind, and the chiefs of the prose writers and poets in Weimar were for some time united. Weimar and Jena became the proper metropolitan cities of Germany, and were of the same importance to our nation which London and Paris are to the English and French, and which since 1806 can no longer be ascribed to any single German city. The new science of religion was disseminated from thence (for Herder also at that time was unfriendly to the old and tasteless system), and the philosophy which had been invented in Königsberg was not merely announced, but was used in Weimar and Jena in a most remarkable way, to give to our whole literature that intellectual power and elevation which have made it the admiration of all Europe. Almost all those, at that time, who explained and developed the science of religion in a manner corresponding to the necessities of the advanced learning and culture of the age were young men of Semler's school; and their labours to establish a new system from the old materials, rejecting what was unsound or useless, were the more serviceable, as the French, The Fragmentist, C. F. Bahrdt, and many of the contributors to the 'German Universal Library,' had already not merely suggested but ripened the thought in the minds of the people, that neither the old building nor its materials possessed any more value. The freer theological movement in Jena and in Weimar may also be further traced back and connected with the freemasonry of the time of Darjes, and with the bolder views which were communicated in lodges under the seal of secrecy. However that may be, the Jena theologian Danov stood almost alone in his time.

Although it was regarded at that time as a great sin to depart even a hair-breadth from the symbolical books, Danov, who followed Heilmann's principles, and like him demonstrated in the Latin language the reasonableness of the old dogmatics, as the Abbot Jerusalem did in ornamental German periods, went no inconsiderable step further than Heilmann had ventured to do in Göttingen. He not merely illustrated and explained religious dogmas according to his method of philosophy, but he did not

hesitate also to attack many of the doctrines of the symbolical confession which Heilmann had left untouched. The new way, which the succeeding generation of teachers followed, in order to announce and exhibit a Christianity wholly purified from the additions of later ages, had been already trodden, before Herder, one of the most distinguished poets of our nation, who had hitherto been closely united with the followers of the old system, began to disseminate new and enlightened views from another side. This, however, will be particularly alluded to hereafter, because it forms only one particular side of Herder's whole poetic and philosophic activity; and here our immediate concern is with universities and professors only.

Among the last mentioned, Griesbach in Jena trod in the steps of Semler, who had been his instructor, but was more prudent and cautious than he, and was not therefore denounced as a heretic as Semler had been. He quietly prepared the materials for all those changes which at a later period were adopted in the confession. Eichhorn sometime after became his colleague, and when he was removed to Göttingen, Paulus taught more freely and openly than Michaelis had done, that in the investigation of the meaning of the Jewish and Christian ancient writings we must examine the meaning of the words, and determine the nature of the contents from the form in which they are clothed. These writers established the principle, that in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, as in the works of classical antiquity, constant regard must be had to criticism, idiom, accommodation, and oriental usages, and all prejudices in favour of a literal inspiration be wholly renounced. Griesbach* pursued a course which was just the opposite of that which had been taken by Semler. He began cautiously and ended boldly; Semler began boldly, and afterwards stood suddenly still. Griesbach's first books were only useful to the learned, to the deeply learned; he left it to others to clothe the surprising results of his critical investigations in a popular and attractive dress; at length, however, he brought together in a philosophical manner the whole results of his inquiries, and comprised all that he regarded as essential to Christianity in a short abridgement. Griesbach, like Semler, animated by a hatred of superstition and fraud, not merely sought out what was false, in order to prove that it was false, without substituting anything else in the

* See Paulus' account of Griesbach. Heidelberg. Jahrbuch, 1812. No. 7.

stead of what was shown to be untrue, but he sought to establish a Christianity which should correspond to the requirements of reason, as well as to the genuine sources of its doctrines and their history. Semler was brought to such a state of mind, that at the time of his controversy with Bahrdt and the author of the 'Wolfenbüttele Fragments,' he declared expressly, that he had never entertained an idea of shaking the credit of the symbolical books of the evangelical church, but had only wished to improve theological learning. He maintained the same principle which many intelligent and zealous advocates of those antiquated symbols are accustomed to maintain in our days, that the so-called symbolical books and formulas are necessary for outward social religion, and for the maintenance of unity and order in the church, that they are the external vehicle which serve to retain the great mass together in the profession of a definite religion; but merely serve to develope inward, living, free, moral religion in the minds of the better informed and more highly cultivated.

The theologians in Jena, as well as Eichhorn and Plank afterwards in Göttingen, acted differently; they believed they might go further than Semler and Griesbach had gone, and perhaps yielded more to the impulses of a period of excitement than is advisable for the teachers of a positive state religion, who are in some degree placemen, paid and therefore bound to deliver a special kind of instruction. When Griesbach emerged from the obscurity of his learning, and was desirous of giving the result of his examination without any presupposed polemical dogmas, he left the scientific and dogmatical parts altogether untouched, and tried to establish and confirm only what might be presented to the people. He did not wish to lead the people into the wilderness of error, in order to guard them against the rejection of all forms of faith, as Semler did by the use of pious fraud, or by means of what had been formerly employed to facilitate the introduction of Christianity, and was called the analogy of faith; but he wished to substitute a popular system of belief, which he had most prudently and cautiously drawn up, for the old dogmatics of the catechism. Griesbach besides only adopted this resolution, when what in popular writing is now abused as rationalism had passed beyond the limits within which we must remain, if we do not mean wholly to destroy the religion of the state, or the positive faith of the mass of the peo-

ple, and along with that, public morality. In his book Griesbach addressed himself to theologians, as guides and overseers of the spiritual welfare of the people, and not as learned men or philosophers. In 1786 he wrote his 'Guide for future Teachers of Religion to the study of popular Dogmatics.' In this work he showed the possibility of teaching religion without dogmatics, not merely to the people but also to the future instructors of the people, without the practice of any pious fraud, or without having recourse, as is now too generally the case, to sophisms, which the people soon learn to detect and to despise. This work appears to us historically more important to our backsliding contemporaries than almost any other, because Griesbach's contemporaries, who were making only too rapid advances, greeted it with great applause. Three editions of 'The Guide' were published in three years. Griesbach distinctly expresses its object by the proposition, that this kind of dogmatics, which is intended to develope the practical influence of the theoretical truths of religion, is very nearly related to the purely popular, intended for those who neither are nor wish to become theologians. Griesbach, as well as Eichhorn, and at a later period, Plank and Paulus, could only produce an effect upon the external, learned, and historical part of religious doctrine, but the new philosophy soon mastered and took possession of its inward nature. Another system of philosophy speedily sprung from that of Kant, against which the complaint has long been made, that its theory, viz. *that all is one*, throws the whole subject of religion into mere speculation and verbiage by its propositions and ideas. It makes God nature, and nature God; and yet the expectation now prevails of the restoration of the true and ancient faith by the instrumentality of its inventor.

§ II.

BASEDOW AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL INSTITUTIONS AT DESSAU, MARSCHLINZ AND HEIDESHEIM.—C. F. BAHRDT, AND HIS TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.—J. A. EBERHARDT AND HIS APOLOGY OF SOCRATES.

We have before mentioned the character which Basedow had undertaken and played, especially in North Germany, as the an-

nouncer of a new system, of which he was to be the author and practical guide. We have stated that at the close of the preceding period he had turned his attention from the reformation of philosophy and theology, in which he came in contact with persons who were in all respects his superiors, to the reformation of public instruction and education, the necessity of which every one felt and acknowledged. Rousseau, La Chalotais, and Fielding in his 'Tom Jones' had preceded him, and Montaigne in the seventeenth century had already paved the way which he proposed to follow. In this pursuit also he was concerned with persons to whom he was equal. He appealed first to the great public, which was at that time addicted to sentimentality, and especially to fathers and mothers. Basedow was precisely the proper man for overturning, storming, and raising alarm, for exciting and rousing up a half rude and half sentimental people. It is, however, altogether inconceivable, and was so indeed to the Germans in general, as soon as the first violent fits of the education fever had passed, how it could be believed that such a man as Basedow was fitted to be the founder of a new system of moral education. When we read the accounts of his daily life, of his love of strife, of his habitual drunkenness, of his conduct toward his sentimental wife,—when we hear his best friends speak of his personal appearance and features,—we would rather suppose that we were reading an English police-report respecting a drunken Irishman, such as are daily brought before the police magistrates in the English metropolis, than a description of the celebrated founder of the new system of education. Again, however, when we compare Rousseau's life with his writings, when we think of the dreadful career of Mirabeau, Marat, Danton, and others, we must be convinced that no radical reforms can be accomplished by mere moral instrumentality, because either wicked deeds like those of Danton are required for that purpose, or unlimited boldness and presumption, such as belonged to Basedow.

At the time in which Basedow appeared as a reformer, school instruction was in a very bad condition. This may be best seen from the autobiographies of Semler and Nicolai, and from their observations upon the description of instruction which was given in the *Pædagogium* in Halle, the most important institution in Germany for the training of teachers; and from the condition in which Mirabeau found the French monarchy in 1789. Do-

mestic education was still in a more miserable plight than public morals. Basedow's very singular call for a public subscription in favour of his elementary work, which has been already mentioned, was attended with the most complete success: this elementary work was to effect all the advantages of a revolution, to collect all science and all practical knowledge into a nutshell, and make them accessible to every child. As early as May, 1771, he had obtained fifteen thousand dollars, towards which sum the Empress of Russia had given a thousand, and many other princes and rich private individuals had made considerable contributions. The so-called elementary book, which preceded the elementary work, was received with the same kind of rejoicing with which all ephemeral productions are received, in cases in which the bookseller or the author understand the art of preliminary puffing. Three reprints were called for within three years, and it was all in vain that the rude and severe Schlözer of Göttingen entered into a contest of life and death with respect to it with Basedow, who sometimes proceeded to pugilistic encounters.

Schlözer, after his own occasionally rude fashion, completely unmasked the *charlatanerie* of Basedow and Wolke. He did this in his preface to La Chalotais' 'Instructor for Youth,' which he translated into German, and whose method he recommended. In addition to this, the most learned and ablest teachers in Germany vigorously opposed this empty scheme;—all proved in vain. Schlegel, who was at that time rector of a school in Heilbronn, and who, in imitation of the founder of Christianity, had devoted his whole life and labour to the training and education of youth, had already accomplished within a limited sphere everything which Basedow so ostentatiously promised but never fulfilled; and he too endeavoured, like Schlözer, to convince the German people that no true and solid training and education was ever to be expected from such a system: but he preached to deaf ears; the age and its necessities, which are mightier than all reasons, turned the scale in favour of Basedow.

In order to furnish some explanation of the enthusiasm which this mountebank, Basedow, excited, we must bear in mind the miserable condition into which the Latin schools founded and instituted by Melanchthon and his scholars had fallen, we must be aware of the torments which the pupils were obliged to endure, in order to learn Latin, without gaining any knowledge

of the Roman writers. The Jurists seldom if ever learned Greek, and the theologians to read the New Testament only. Basedow replied to Schlözer's remarks in the tone of a drunken sailor, and yet this was the man who was thought capable of founding and directing an institution for the promotion of the best interests of humanity. The Danish government and the kind and humane prince of Dessau, who was anxious to have the institution in his capital, conferred more favours upon Basedow than in those stingy times were bestowed upon the most learned men in Germany. He was allowed to retain his Danish income of eight hundred dollars, and on coming to Dessau received eleven hundred in addition from the prince.

The elementary book was no sooner published than it found its way into every family, and measures were taken to found a Philanthropium in Dessau. Basedow and his education became topics of the same importance and popularity as railroads, monuments, and the cathedral in Cologne have become in our days. The reformation of mankind and its well-being were then as confidently expected as the results of sentimental education, as they are at present supposed to depend on the progress of their substantial interests. What is most singular is, that there were persons who were desirous of introducing Rousseau's 'Idylls of Life' into the schools, and his freedom from all conventional restraints into families; whilst political life on the whole continent lay in complete bondage under the heavy chains of an arbitrary police, torture was employed by the courts as a means of attaining truth, and the stick was freely used as an instrument of correction. The theology of the first half of the eighteenth century taught that the sinfulness of the youthful mind, the consequence of the sin of our first parents, was to be subdued and rooted out by cant, religious discipline, and deprivation. Basedow and Rousseau recommended that we should place greater confidence in nature than in discipline, implant nothing in the mind which would not early ripen to maturity, and teach nothing which could not be made obvious to the mind of the pupil. If the advantages were not easily made apparent, which in such an age might be derived from the mad and perverse impulses of such men as Basedow and Wolke, we could not possibly conceive how men like these could secure confidence enough to be supposed capable of conducting with intelligence and economy a great institution, such as the Philanthropium was intended to be.

The riddle is solved, by calling to mind that things had come to such a pass, that a revolution was necessary, and not merely a reform. Basedow was born for such a crisis,—to overturn and to destroy. His rude and violent disposition was perfectly suited to the work. In practical life, experienced, peaceful and thoughtful men would have allowed existing usages and institutions to remain, and have endeavoured to improve whatever was antiquated, and thus have given to them a new and a better form: but Basedow shouted, stormed, cried aloud, set all the world in commotion and overturned the whole edifice, and hence Campe, Salzmann, and whole armies of writers for youth were placed in a situation to erect an entirely new one. In this way the middle classes at length obtained a literature suitable to their information and taste, although it was but weak and sentimental, and communal and practical schools were established. It was probably on these or on similar grounds that such men as Lavater and Iselin gave so favourable a reception and such assistance to the cause of Basedow and his chimæras. Iselin enjoyed great reputation in Switzerland and South Germany as a practical statesman, whilst Lavater was honoured in the religious world; and there were many contributors to Iselin's 'Ephemeridæ of Mankind,' such as J. G. Schlosser, who were far from being airy projectors, and who were yet favourable to the scheme of the Philanthropium.

With respect to Lavater in particular, however obnoxious to the charge of conservative Jesuitism he might be, on this occasion he was so honourably active in promoting the progress of general improvement and instruction that he deserves great commendation, and especially for having wholly laid aside his religious prejudices. In a formal and solemn manner he introduced the same Dr. Bahrdt as director of the first Philanthropium which was erected according to Basedow's plan, whom Göze in Hamburg, in his printed works, persecuted as an enemy of Christianity. Count Ulysses von Salis, of Marschlinz in the Grisons, was partly interested, partly a believer in Basedow's visionary illusions, and partly influenced by the expectation of making a good money speculation of a Philanthropium, and was therefore anxious to erect one in Marschlinz before that projected in Dessau was completed. He offered the direction and superintendence to Basedow. The latter declined the offer for himself, but recommended in his stead the gentle Dr. Bahrdt, of

whom the professors in Giessen were very anxious to get rid at that very time. Bahrdt roused the necessary attention to the subject, erected the first German Philanthropium with noisy applause and clamorous solemnity, and Lavater installed him as its director.

The first Philanthropium, founded by Count von Salis at Marschlinz and erected by Bahrdt, ran a short and melancholy course and disappeared without leaving a trace behind; the second, which was established by Bahrdt in a castle belonging to Count Leiningen at Heidesheim in the Palatinate, came to a shameful end, and Bahrdt was obliged to flee from the institution as a cheat and impostor; and even Basedow's own institution, after a momentary effulgence, again disappeared, not however without leaving considerable traces behind, and enlightening the succeeding generation. The effects were only mediate, but they were not on that account less considerable and comprehensive. The whole nature of the school system has undergone a thorough change among us in our century, in some places earlier and in some later, and then arose a kind of literature altogether peculiar. The authorities awoke from their long slumber, as a new generation took their seats in the consistories, to whom, alas! the oversight of the schools was entrusted. German institutions were established, in which an education was given calculated to qualify men for the practical business of life; the middle classes were trained and taught as their circumstances of life required them to be; and the female sex, whose education had previously been completely neglected, was rescued from that servile condition to which it had been condemned.

In Basedow's Philanthropium at Dessau, the rich, in return for a high remuneration, were to be educated for the duties of life; the poor, under the name of famulants, at a very small expense were to be trained for schoolmasters; but neither the one class nor the other, from the very beginning, had confidence in the mountebank. He opened his institution without pupils on the 27th of December 1774. In the following year however nine boarders and six famulants had been found. Basedow himself did nothing for the institution; he spent his time in bed, and with a passion for writing worked at his elementary and other books. This revolution in education experienced the same fate as the great political revolution in France: the noble enthusiasm of the best friends of humanity, and the efforts of a time never

again to return under so serene and fresh an aspect, were abused by miserable and contemptible declaimers! Basedow rendered no practical services which any tolerably well-educated village schoolmaster could not have done as well, and yet he dared to threaten the whole population of Europe with his displeasure if money was not raised for the promotion of his plans. He published a printed letter from his bed, in which he threatened, that if ten thousand ducats were not received for the support and furtherance of his Philanthropium before Easter, 1776, he would withdraw his hand from the support of mankind, and relinquish an institution to which he devoted a great portion of his time and on which he had expended some thousand dollars. The printed invitation which he issued in November, 1774, in which the public were invited to visit and contribute to the support of his new institution, for the board and education of youthful pupils, and of persons of more advanced age who were to be teachers, whose full title we give in the note*, is worthy of remark, not merely for its singular contents and its title, but as characteristic of the young intellectual life in Germany, and, alas! also of the exaggerated direction which Basedow from vanity and his own inflated ideas attempted to give to the delightful and wholly national enthusiasm. As Lavater had promoted Bahrdt's new institution in Marschlinz, without being deterred by the consideration of his errors in faith, and had taken part in his initiation from zeal for human welfare and the advancement of a better education, Iselin on the same grounds now supported Basedow's projected institution in Dessau. He therefore proposed to become curator along with Basedow; and in connexion with Lavater he induced two noble and distinguished men to sacrifice themselves for the furtherance of Basedow's rhodomontades. Simon and Schweighäuser, two learned, classically educated, and truly noble-minded men, encouraged and prompted by Lavater and Iselin, resolved to unite their fortunes with the empirics and boasters, Basedow and Wolke. In furtherance of their plans, they founded a formal society for the institution of schools and the promotion of education; and like a religious order they thus

* "The Philanthropium erected in Dessau—a school of philanthropy and of valuable knowledge for learners and young teachers, poor and rich. A Fidei commissio of the public for perfecting the means of education for all places, according to the plan of the elementary book. Recommended to the benevolent among princes, to philanthropical societies, and private persons, by J. B. Basedow." Leipzig, 1774, pp. 96.

established a kind of propaganda for the dissemination of their zeal and for the advancement of their system.

This school union was formally bound together by rules like a spiritual order of knighthood, or of monks; and a periodical, denominated 'Philanthropic Archives,' was issued, containing a programme of the new foundation. The title of these 'Archives' announced to the world that their deliverance was to spring from Dessau. The first number of the journal contains the rules of the new order*. The reputation of Simon and Schweighäuser, who were men of great scholastic and classical attainments, gave the new institution a high scientific importance; and as Basedow had begun to be sensible of his own utter incapacity (for he was a highly immoral, vulgar and unpractical man) to direct its pecuniary administration, the Philanthropium at Dessau appeared likely to surmount the pecuniary embarrassments into which it had been plunged by Basedow. He was replaced by Campe, who was somewhat too well versed in domestic economy, as was particularly shown at a later period by his management of his boarding-institution in Hamburg. Campe, a practical and calculating regimental chaplain, undertook the guidance of the institution as associate-curator, whilst the kind and humane prince of Dessau not only promised money but a building, and everything seemed to take a prosperous course, till Basedow's vulgarity and domineering spirit drove away all those who could have rendered him efficient assistance.

About this time Campe and Salzmann almost contemporaneously began their career as teachers and writers,—a career which was as advantageous to the improvement of the people, as it has proved injurious to genuine scientific knowledge and to true poetry. They and their successors and imitators soon deluged Germany with a silly literature for children, and sought to bring up little children in such a way as to make grown people into

* The title runs thus :—"Philanthropic Archives, issued by the associated friends of youth, and directed to all the guardians of mankind, especially to those who are desirous of promoting improvement in school education; also to fathers who may wish to send their children to the Dessau Philanthropium." The rules of the order are as follows :—1. The members devote themselves and their whole life to education and its improvement. 2. The unmarried shall only marry wives who can be meet helpmates in their plans. 3. Their children from their birth are to be trained in their principles and to succeed them in their office. 4. Besides social and human duties, each is daily either (*a*) to give instruction or direct the youth; (*b*.) to prepare or improve school-books; (*c*.) to correspond, or travel, or advise, &c. 5. To be true to one another as brethren, and to do everything possible for their order.

children. They were zealous opponents of both jesuitical and pietistical education, because they, as well as the Jesuits, understood how to secure the favour both of children and parents. They put an end indeed to all pedantry, but we must ascribe to them and their plans the sauciness and pertness of that all-knowing and therefore ignorant and presumptuous generation of youths, who have been superficially educated by them, and of whom we have so many examples.

The splendid period of the Philanthropium at Dessau commenced with one of those ceremonial and mountebank pageants, of which we now read of two or three every month trumpeted in the newspapers. There was a public examination appointed to be held on the 13th, 14th and 15th of May, 1776: to this examination Basedow, in his peculiar and ostentatious style, invited all the cosmopolites of Germany, and detailed the proceedings in two successive numbers of the 'Archives'; and the learned Rector Stroth of Quedlinburg devoted a whole book to its description. The notoriety thus given, but especially the lively zeal of Simon and Schweighäuser, raised the institution in public estimation, and pupils came even from France. Basedow himself however saw that he was wholly unfit to be curator: he retired from the direction in December, 1776, yet still retained the office of religious instructor, and when he had been guilty of gross excesses in fits of deep intoxication, often quoted his own example as a warning and means of deterring others. He had unhappily retained so much of the management in the general affairs as to cause great annoyance and anxiety to Campe, who had undertaken the direction, and who in consequence finally left Basedow and the institution to their fate.

Campe, as curator and in connexion with Basedow, commenced the publication of the 'Pædagogical Conversations,' as a substitute for the 'Philanthropic Archives,' which have had a very beneficial influence upon a well-disposed nation like ours, scattered about in small towns, however much the inhabitants of great cities and men of the world may sometimes feel disposed to smile at the sentimentality and the idylls of the parsonage and the mansion-house. Imaginative descriptions were given of family life and education; and to the great joy of mothers, all earnestness and severity were discountenanced in the training of the young, and as much as possible banished from life. Under Campe's direction the Philanthropium in Dessau bloomed afresh,

and in the summer of 1777 contained as many as fifty pupils. The prince of Dessau had appropriated the Dietrich palace for its use, Basedow got back the four thousand dollars which he had expended, and there were six thousand more in the reserve treasury ; but the quarrelsome Basedow still continued to furnish grounds for strife and animosity. The benevolent prince sought to remove all subjects of disagreement, and for that purpose induced Basedow again to take a share in the management. A temporary state of peace ensued, but it soon appeared that nothing was or could be effected with this intolerable and domineering drunkard.

The overthrow of the Philanthropium became quite unavoidable as soon as Basedow again undertook the direction, and its fall produced somewhat the same effects with respect to education which the confusion of tongues at the building of Babel must have done for the early culture and civilization of Asia. The teachers from Dessau were scattered about in all parts of Germany, and each applied Basedow's ideas according to his own plan ; they erected institutions, and converted what had been previously an honourable office into a trade.

Campe left the institution in Dessau in September, 1777. The only two learned, scientific, and thoroughly able teachers in the institution, Simon and Schweighäuser, went to Strasburg. Wolke became chief of the Philanthropium, for Basedow himself once again, and that finally, retired at Easter, 1778. Salzmann undertook Basedow's department as instructor in religion ; and since that time educational institutions have sprung up in all directions like manufactories. Campe's institution near Hamburg, and that of Salzmann in the castle of Schnepfenthal near Gotha, are the most celebrated of these private seminaries which sprung from the ruins of the Philanthropium. They were formed after its model, and took its principles as their groundwork. They have had success, because they were arranged upon a less colossal plan, and were better suited to the requirements of parents than the Philanthropium in Dessau. This institution continued to prolong a sickly existence for five years more. It had however attained its aim, for instruction was now given in all ends and corners of Germany. After the manner recommended by Basedow, Campe and Salzmann, and ten years after the establishment of the Philanthropium (1784—1788), Latin was taught in the lowest classes in a learned school situated

at the extreme end of Germany on the shores of the North Sea, from a Latin translation of Campe's 'Robinson Crusoe,' from Schütze's elementary work, and Gedike's reading-book: an intelligent rector however afterwards again added 'Cornelius Nepos.'

We must admit that the learned and solid education of the higher classes of society, and of the learned, gained little by the too hasty introduction of the new method and of the new books, except in neighbourhoods where schools for practical knowledge were wholly wanting, or where the teachers were excessively incompetent. This revolution brought much greater benefits to the middle classes and peasants than to the learned and fashionable. Basedow and the speculating undertakers of these boarding-institutions, always kept their eye upon the people who could pay, and were very little acquainted with the means of rendering any useful services to the labouring classes. They knew very little of their real wants, or of the causes of their rudeness and immorality, because they were neither official persons, nor had they studied political economy, like the two persons whom we shall now name as distinguished above their contemporaries. These are J. G. Schlosser, who held a high official station under the noble Margrave Charles Frederick of Baden, a man unceasingly active for the good of his country; and capable of making true sacrifices for its well-being; and von Rochow, heir to the lordship of Rekahn and prebendary of Halberstadt. The former, who was afterwards recorder of Frankfort, although a Platonist, declared himself to be unfavourable to all utopian dreams; and in his own person he furnished an example of a man, who knew how to render substantial services to the people without promoting revolution. In the spirit of a Turgot, and of those economists, to whose system his noble prince, like the Grand Duke of Tuscany, was eager to give a practical application, he wrote his 'Morals for Countrypeople' (1770), from which Campe, who, as is well known, had no ideas of his own, afterwards borrowed the main parts of his 'Morals for Children.' Schlosser's work belongs to the best among the popular books of our nation, and deserves a place along with the first part of Pestalozzi's 'Lienhard and Gertraud.' Rochow not only rendered great service by his practical schemes for instruction in country schools, which were so admirable as to raise the schools on his lordship to the condition of normal schools

for German village-schoolmasters, but by writing a guide for the training and education of countrymen.

Schlosser's Catechism is confined wholly to morality. In Rochow's 'Attempt at a School-book for Children of Country-people, or for the use of Village Schools,' all sorts of knowledge are treated of which might be useful to the countryman in his sphere of life. The little book was intended to point out the path to prosperity to the rich peasant as well as to the poor, and even to the day-labourer. Children were here instructed in the best means of manuring land, foddering horses, keeping agricultural implements in order, &c. The teachers in Rekahn were also remarkably well paid, and Von Rochow was the only man, with the exception of the prince of Dessau, who made use of the Philanthropium in order to train masters. Of the six famulants who were in the institution, two were sent by Von Rochow, and the remainder by the prince of Dessau. Rochow's school-book met with great success; there appeared in 1776 a new and much improved edition with engravings. About the same time the same author wrote his 'Children's Friend, a Reading-book for the use of Country Schools,' which he printed at his own cost, and endeavoured to secure for it a large circulation among the people, by selling it at a very cheap price.

In consequence of the complete change thus effected in the nature of education and instruction, as well as from a prevailing feeling of the necessity of a system of religion purified from the dross of the middle ages, a wide field was opened up for the operations of a number of men who sought to take advantage of this earnest and serious movement for the advancement of their own mean or mercenary views. Among those who grossly abused their talents and knowledge, Bahrdt deserves the first place, in consequence of his notoriety, and his power of exacting and engaging public attention. He availed himself of the growing desire in the former half of the century for freedom from religious impositions, as well as of the wish of his contemporaries wholly to deliver the young from slavish discipline and from pedantic instruction, to realize his own mean speculations and his degrading frauds. If we read the autobiography of this shameless theologian, or if we take the trouble to compare what Pott has written concerning his life and conduct with the accounts communicated to the public in two different volumes of

Schlichtegroll's 'Necrology,' we must deeply lament that the German nation, in the moments of its awakening to new life, allowed itself to be led astray for so long a time by such a scandalous writer. Bahrdt long excited great attention, because, notwithstanding his generally well-known immorality, he possessed the power of adopting a tone which was suited to a rude people. His vagabond mode of life brought him into connexion with all those who wished for a revolution in religion, because they were sunk in immorality, and the idea of a reform was too high for them. Wherever he was, in Erfurt, in Giessen, in the Grisons, on the Rhine or in Halle, there existed a school of licentiousness.

He was appointed professor of philosophy in Erfurt, at the time when Riedel, who had previously been a companion of Klotz in his vulgarity and his dissolute life, was giving the tone and speculating upon the spirit of the age, which was favourable to a departure from traditionary doctrines, because the defenders of orthodoxy had exposed themselves to ridicule and contempt. Bahrdt understood how to assume an air of learning which he never possessed, and chose the path of heterodoxy because that was the fashion, brought in money, and was patronized by the noble and clever men of the time in opposition to mysticism and hypocrisy. In the dogmatics and morality which he taught and published in Erfurt, he remained however so completely within the limits of propriety, that the good Semler took him merely for an honest opponent of the ancient darkness, and not a wolf in sheep's clothing, and therefore recommended him to a professorship in Giessen. In this situation his enlightenment and his application of reason for the interpretation of the Scriptures and systems of faith, contributed largely to his success as a writer, because he stood isolated, or nearly so, amongst the theologians in that university, because he was powerful in the use of the German language, and had brought with him from the old schools a considerable mass of positive knowledge in which the later Rationalists were often deficient. He knew the wants of the powerful party, who at that time sought for freedom from the oppressive yoke of pedantic orthodoxy at any price, and he was able to write in an easy, popular, and moral style, as well as with great feeling, and to accommodate himself to whatever circumstances or the ruling taste might demand. His writings were consequently extensively read, and he expresses himself

quite like a tradesman upon the subject, computing his services according to the standard of the gulden and kreutzers which he had realized.

He began with sermons, then wrote his homiletics, and a critical apparatus for the study of the Old Testament in Latin, at the very time in which Kennicott, who collected various readings, and J. D. Michaelis brought the Old Testament criticism into fashion. He projected a history of the New Testament, proposed an explanation and critical examination of the confession of our church, and wrote remarks upon Michaelis' translation of the Bible. In the course of time he became bolder and bolder against the ecclesiastical systems of faith, for the promulgation of which, as a professor and preacher, he had been invited to Giessen. He did not so much seek to refute error and to search for truth, as to ridicule and sneer at whatever did not please his vulgarity of mind; and finally, with profane hand and prosaic sense, he touched the venerable documents of Christianity and its sublime poetry. In all this he speculated quite correctly upon the calculated progress of an enlightenment disseminated by novels and popular writings, upon the rapid advance in the change of the German language and of style in the eighth decennium of the preceding century, when he announced a new translation of the New Testament.

This new translation, or rather this New Testament travestied by C. F. Bahrdt, was, at that time, when everything must be new, circulated extensively in north Germany, and went through three editions in nine years, although in our days the title of the book, which was then inviting, would be sufficient to deter most persons from its perusal. This title, which was to allure readers, is borrowed from the most miserable fabrications of the book-makers of the age: it runs thus;—"The New Testament; or the newest instruction from God through Jesus and his Apostles;" and in the first edition it was made still more prodigious by the addition—"in Histories and Letters." Open this so-called translation where we will, we immediately perceive the impious wantonness with which Bahrdt, we will not say has treated religion, but antiquity and its oriental histories. Every breath of the East, every shade of nationality has altogether disappeared, and every religious feeling is stifled by his cold, rational and sometimes irrational prose.

Bahrdt took no time to weigh his expressions; wherever dia-

logue is introduced, he turned it into narrative, and rooted out all those expressions of Luther which had become and are dear to our minds by traditional use, and by faith united with obscure and undefined feelings, by a mysterious, but often also a pure religious signification. Such expressions as 'kingdom of God,' 'holiness,' 'sanctification,' 'Saviour' or 'Redeemer,' 'way of salvation,' 'Holy Ghost,' 'name of Jesus,' &c. are not to be found in his translation. But the public mind had by no means reached such a point in its departure from old usages, as to endure the absence of phrases and terms sanctified by long ecclesiastical use; there arose therefore a fearful storm against Bahr^{dt}, which threatened consequences the more to be apprehended by him, as it originated in his own neighbourhood; and C. F. von Moser, who had great influence there, had to a wonderful extent retained his attachment to pietistic notions, whilst he adopted liberal political views. Bahr^{dt} would have been undoubtedly utterly forsaken by all the friends of religious enlightenment before his departure for Marschlinz, if the irrational conduct of the defenders of antiquated usages had not raised up friends for him, and gained him protection from the defenders of rational religion, in the same manner precisely as Lavater had been led to introduce him to Marschlinz. The German public of that age was far behind ours of the present day, which may probably be called Young Germany, in the use of terms of abuse,—such as Carbonari, Jacobins, Communists, Chartists, and Radicals; and it will be seen from some of the passages selected from Bahr^{dt}'s translation, and given in the note, that a man might sin against sound understanding and pure taste, if he only contrived to assume the appearance of writing in the modern style*.

Bahr^{dt} afterwards played the part of a little Basedow in Marschlinz, not that he had a single spark of Basedow's true, although often irrational inspiration for the cause of mankind. In Bahr^{dt} everything was artificial and vulgar, and calculated

* Matth. v. 4. in the first edition: "Happy those who prefer the sweet melancholy of virtue to the pleasant joys of sin!" Third edit.: "Happy those for whom this earth has few pleasures! they shall be richly rewarded." Mark ii. 8; "The Son of Man is therefore Lord also of the Sabbath," is translated as follows, first edit.: "Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath; consequently the duties of the outward service of God must be subordinate to the duties of man." Third edit.: "The Sabbath is for the sake of man, not man for the Sabbath; consequently man and his claims must be regarded in preference to the keeping of the Sabbath."

for the realization of the most vulgar ends. Notwithstanding all this he was invited to Dürkheim by the Count von Leiningen, as general-superintendent, and there too he went through the comedy of getting up a third ephemeral German Philanthropium in the castle at Heidesheim (1776).

We mention the destiny and writings of this man merely for the purpose of showing, by his example, how great the necessities of that age were, and of illustrating the earnestness of its desires to escape from the mental bondage in which it was enthralled and to breathe a freer air. This would become still more obvious, if we followed up his history and more minutely traced out the events of his life,—if we followed him through his course of chicanery in Heidesheim, through his dissolute career of life, and enumerated the public frauds which he practised on the German Union in Halle. It would be seen, that wherever he came, he was received and praised as a man of talents, and looked upon as a martyr to his zeal for religious enlightenment. No stronger proof of the state of feeling with regard to him can be afforded, than the mere mention of the fact, that such a man as Teller interested himself for him, and secured him a place of refuge in Prussia; and the dislike which was felt towards the blind zealot and pastor in Hamburg had an influence even upon Semler, because Götze, while protesting personally against Bahrdt, his character and works, appeared to express himself as the enemy of freedom of opinion.

The blind rage of the Lutheran zealot in Hamburg, and the too precipitate attack of Joseph the Second, who persecuted Bahrdt, deprived him of the rights of the empire and of the privileges of the Protestant church, by means of a decree of the imperial council; all this happened at a most favourable conjuncture for Dr. Bahrdt. He had reached the goal of his dissolute course at Heidesheim, and had even made a journey of pure chicanery to England, and was therefore in great need of that protection which the persecutions directed against him contributed to secure him; and which he would never have received, had it not appeared, as if two narrow-minded zealots, the one protestant and the other catholic, were eager, in Bahrdt's person, to persecute the principle of the employment of reason in matters of faith. This secured him the aid and protection of all men of intelligent and free minds. Götze, in Hamburg, had made the Lutheran confession of faith, and the reigning religion, as exhi-

bited in sermons and catechisms, either hated or ridiculous in the eyes of all intelligent men, by the manner in which he explained and defended it. He had also at an earlier period published a book against the first edition of Bahrdr's translation of the New Testament. This work is entitled, 'A clear Proof that Dr. Bahrdr's Translation of the New Testament is nothing else than Blasphemy.' Bahrdr's suspension and removal from Giesen were the immediate consequences of these friendly and loving remarks. The reasons alleged against Bahrdr are no better than those which the suffragan bishop of Worms, who had long remained a quiet spectator, without showing any symptoms of animosity, brought forward, in order to drive away the same man from Heidesheim. The suffragan bishop, who had been personally offended, instigated by an inhabitant of the Palatinate, whom Bahrdr had calumniated and injured, declared that Bahrdr had gone beyond the limits of the law, and put himself out of its protection, because he had announced and maintained doctrines which were unsupported by any of the three confessions which alone were lawful in the empire. This accusation, which was made by the suffragan bishop, who was the emperor's censor of books in Frankfort on the Mayne, was reported by the attorney-general to the council of the empire, which in this case ventured upon a step hitherto quite unheard of, without citation, without a formal process, or without asking the lord of the accused or the *Corpus Evangelicorum*.

Without any further proceeding, the council declared Bahrdr guilty of doubting the doctrine of the Trinity, &c.; removed him from his office, which it was competent for the sovereign lord alone to do, and obliged him either to recant his errors or to depart the empire. The Count of Leiningen, it is true, took him under his protection, but he was only the possessor of a small lordship, and was anxiously desirous of obtaining the title of prince, and this circumstance made the council of the empire bold enough to issue a decree, directed to the Count, in which they commanded him to dismiss Bahrdr from his office.

In consequence of this procedure, Bahrdr's case assumed a new and different form; it now became a question of freedom of speech, between the council of the empire and the German protestants, and Bahrdr applied to the two most distinguished defenders of free and unbiassed inquiry, to Provost Teller in Berlin, and Semler in Halle; and the former, by his interest and repre-

sentations, succeeded in securing favour to his cause at the Prussian court. Bahrdt was assisted with money, and received permission to read lectures in Halle, but not on theological subjects. Semler was at this time decried as a man who held back the truth, or veiled it in obscurity, in the same manner as Götze, who now persecuted Bahrdt*, had previously denounced him as a heretic, a falsifier of Christian doctrine, and a corrupter of youth. On this occasion Semler might have been well excused for not wishing to endure the presence of a man who had been everywhere regarded as a moral pest, in a university where Klotz, about the middle of the century, had founded a school of shocking and gross immorality, such as is by far too common in our universities, and which did not cease after his death. Semler, indeed, could not and would not adduce this reason; he therefore forfeited the good opinion of the friends of freedom of speech, because he appeared as if he wished to attach himself to Götze, or to favour the cause of the suffragan bishop of Worms, the imperial attorney-general and the council of the empire.

Bahrdt had drawn up a confession of his faith, which Teller caused to be printed (1779), but which Semler vehemently disapproved of and publicly attacked. This course was as precipitate as it was needless, because every intelligent man ought to have known, that a man like Bahrdt would only draw up such a confession as might promote his interests or serve his rude and sensual gratifications. It was therefore quite absurd to attach importance to anything which came from Bahrdt, and that Semler unwisely did. He made a vehement and severe personal attack on Bahrdt, in a journal which Schlözer published, and which was read, not only by theologians, but also by public officials, by statesmen, and by all those who were connected with the government or police. This attack was so severe, that even Schlözer thought himself bound to receive Bahrdt's defence, that he might not suffer the question of freedom of speech to become one in which the police might intermeddle†. The authorities in Berlin also, in the same manner as Schlözer, did

* How miserable the reasons were which Götze employed against Bahrdt, and what a poor feticism he defended as Lutheranism, may be best seen from an example. He accuses Bahrdt, by the manner in which he translated, "And lo! I am with you always," &c., of having wished to rob the faithful of a consolatory passage, which proves the universal presence of the human nature of Christ.

† Schlözer's Correspondence, No. xxix. p. 332; No. xxxii. p. 82.

not so much adopt the unworthy man, as his cause, in so far as it was the cause of that justice and right which was due to every citizen of the state. It seemed to the leading men in Berlin to affect their unlimited freedom, and their right of explaining and interpreting religious books according to the best light of their understandings.

Semler at that time shrunk back with terror for fear of radicalism in religion, of which he accused, and on account of which he persecuted, Bahrdt, because, like some of the zealots of our own time, he feared that danger might result to Christianity from the philosophy of the age. Christianity, however, as was said by its Founder, is built upon the rock of our proper nature, which comes from God ; it may therefore bid defiance to all philosophers, and can never be charged with, or mistaken for, the vain fancies of imaginative theologians. Semler trembled with apprehension for fear of Voltaire and the wit of the Encyclopædists, of the powerful scepticism of Lessing, of the excessive boldness of the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentists, and above all at the thought that Bahrdt, after his fashion, might promote Deism in Halle, which the author of the ‘Apology of Socrates,’ as professor of philosophy and of natural religion, at that time taught.

J. A. Eberhard, the author of the above-mentioned ‘Apology of Socrates,’ was a protestant divine, but, after the first appearance of his work in 1772, met with no favour or encouragement from the consistories, whose members then belonged to the prevailing orthodox party. He was obliged to content himself with some miserable livings, until the same Teller, who assisted Bahrdt through his difficulties, also undertook his cause. He induced the minister Zedlitz to procure for him through Frederick the Second a situation in Charlottenburg, and whilst there, Eberhard wrote a treatise on the ‘General Theory of Thinking and Feeling,’ which gained the prize proposed by the Berlin Academy (1776). In this treatise he developed his philosophical system, and was in consequence, but against his own wish, appointed professor of philosophy in Halle (1778). The tendencies of the great majority of the students in Halle were theological ; Eberhard therefore applied his system to theology, and became remarkable for the voluminous nature of his writings, which, as is well known, is a bad character for a philosopher ; but he nevertheless enjoyed a high reputation as a man and a

scholar, because people were not then very punctilious about great logical accuracy or depth of thought. He commenced a journal of his own, in order to disseminate his deistical notions; and by principles and arguments similar to those propounded in his 'Apology of Socrates,' he shook the foundations of the orthodoxy of the rising generation, which had been educated after the fashion of Basedow and Rousseau. Three improved and enlarged editions of his 'Apology' were published in rapid succession. His influence was not chiefly scientific and learned: his writings did not work so much upon the minds of thinking and investigating men, as upon the great public, by means of his eloquence. He was broad and diffuse, rather than deep.

Eberhard was a quiet and moderate man, possessed of various learning, and whose mind and character were well suited to the circumstances of the literature of his time: his writings therefore made a great impression in quarters where the immoral Bahrdr was despised, and where no part of his smooth, easy morals, often couched in the style of romances, would have been admitted. In his chief work, Eberhard, properly speaking, directed his attacks against the old dogmatics, and proved, or at least attempted to prove, that none of the leading doctrines of the system were capable of being maintained. He made the matter however very easy to himself, in a similar manner as the French Academicians did, only with this difference, that he was a serious and honourable man, and that they spoke in jest. Eberhard alleged,—and there was scarcely any man who gave him a solid refutation except Lessing, who was likewise denounced as an infidel,—that neither the doctrine of predestination, that of the atonement, of the operation of divine grace, of hell torments, nor a number of others, had any foundation in the Scriptures; and that, besides, they were contradictory to reason and dangerous to morality. Nicolai promoted the same sort of faith and of philosophy in Berlin, not only as a writer and publisher, but in his 'Universal German Library,' he brought a whole band of well-armed and bold warriors in favour of the same principles into the field.

§ III. A.

NICOLAI AND THE 'UNIVERSAL GERMAN LIBRARY.'—WIELAND, THE BROTHERS JACOBI, AND THE 'GERMAN MERCURY.'

In the beginning and former half of the eighteenth century, criticism in Germany was in such miserable hands, that it might be almost believed, that Gottsched had been withal one of its best critics ; and how did not he and his creatures who served under his banners abuse their art ! When Gottsched's critical reputation was lost, in consequence of the gross abuse which he, his colleagues and dependents made of their journal, Klotz began to play the same vulgar critical game in Halle which Gottsched and his clique had carried on in Leipzig. Klotz, like Gottsched, availed himself of his criticism only to promote the meanest personal ends. He trumpeted forth the praises of his clients and creatures, and sought after his fashion to expose to ridicule, and if possible to put down, every able man and sound scholar who despised his vulgar and mean clan ; and it is remarkable that the easy Germans, even down till our own days, when at last all critical tribunals have completely lost their reputation and influence, have allowed themselves to be led and their judgments to be determined by such men, by the learned presumption of journalists and reviewers. Literature was dependent successively upon Gottsched, Klotz, and the contemptible Riedel, the 'Universal German Library,' and the 'Jena Universal Literary Journal:' we must therefore here once more touch upon the course and progress of criticism.

Klotz and Riedel were men without principles or morals, but they were both men of talents, and Klotz was master of an easy and flowing Latin style, which in those times was of great value. He had also a large retinue of followers among the class of licentious students and others, who saw with pleasure a school of extreme licentiousness rising up in opposition to the Halle pietism. The students were pleased with the dissolute life which Klotz led, with the insolent and swaggering tone in which he read his lectures, with the renomistic character of his writings and his critical mischief. Both Klotz and Riedel may have been said to reign through the instrumentality of a number of periodicals, which were open to their lucubrations, and Klotz was

regarded as a man possessed of a great knowledge of antiquity and of art, till Lessing and Herder came forward as his opponents, and by their vehemence and ability destroyed his renown and scattered his miserable host of adherents; for they despoiled him of the glory which he knew how to shed around himself, in the mere dawning of German improvement and before the full light of day. As Klotz was at enmity with the 'Universal German Library,' Riedel's aid was of great value to him. He gained this accession through the elector of Mayence, who, with a view to add new splendour to the university of Erfurt, appointed Riedel to a professorship. He succeeded in inducing the elector to invite Wieland also to leave the chancery in Biberach and to come to Erfurt. Klotz sought to win Wieland by means of Riedel, but the practical Swabian was a better diplomatist than both: he kept them certainly in good humour as long as he needed a blast of their trumpet, but he entered into no critical alliance with them; on the contrary, he endeavoured as soon as possible to establish an organ for himself, because in the opinion of the majority of readers he has always the best of the argument who speaks last, loudest and most unreasonably.

Riedel was a fellow-labourer in his 'Library of the Fine Arts,' till he also disagreed with Klotz, and then he immediately published a 'Philosophical Library' of his own, in which works were reviewed under his leading and after his manner. But Riedel did not stop there; he became also a contributor to the 'Leipzig New Library' and other periodicals, and indulged in pasquinades, satires and libels, by which he excited universal attention, because he was universally feared. Wieland, who had much worldly wisdom, knew how dishonest and dangerous Riedel was, but he knew also the way in which reputation was made and ruined in Germany. He was afraid of Riedel, and therefore, as we learn from his correspondence, gave him many civil words, but prudently avoided all intimate connexion with him. They were in fact ill suited to each other; Wieland was a man of regular life and honest character, Riedel was a profligate.

Klotz had now for a long time ruled far and wide in the domains of learning, by means of his Latin and German criticisms; he had given up his German reviews in the Halle learned periodicals, and in 1767 founded his 'German Library' as a vehicle for his reviews, especially in those branches of literature which he could not properly introduce into his Latin journal ('Acta Literaria'). But it was made evident in his case how easily

the mere learned vapour of an artificial reputation is destroyed, when men appear who discover the clay feet upon which the colossus rests its immense mass, by which the world has been kept in astonishment and fear. The attack upon Klotz, commenced simultaneously by Lessing and Herder, was so vigorous and unexpected, that every one was astonished that persons had been found who were not only equal to him in talents and knowledge,—for that would have been easy,—but who were even superior to him in vehemence and severity, and who opposed his assumption in language still stronger than his own. Nicolai also, in the second article of the eighth volume of the ‘Universal German Library,’ did what he could to expose the weakness of Klotz. Klotz died precisely at the right time, because his reputation was ruined and the maintenance of his position and influence had become impossible. Criticism, or rather the right of dispensing praise and blame to the learned Germans, appeared thereby to fall exclusively into the hands of Nicolai and to his Library.

From the way in which Nicolai ruled the judgment of the German public, by means of his ‘Universal German Library,’ which he conducted almost alone, he became so presumptuous that many voices began to be raised against him, and an effort was made to put an end to that unlimited power which he arrogated to himself, as the valourous and autocratic representative of that broad and practical but sound common-sense, which was founded upon the Wolfian philosophy. He thought he could rule in the departments of philosophy, theology, and even poetry, of which he had not the least idea, as he had ruled the reviewers in his Library. Not only the fanatics, mystics, orthodox, and the whole school of puffers who were persecuted by him, rose up against him,—not only Hermann, Herder and Kant were embittered, but even Jacobi, who was anxious to tread a middle path between the old system and the reflective wisdom of the Berlin philosophers, who were imitators of the French; and Wieland also lent his aid to oppose the partiality of the new tribunal. Nicolai drove onward with that boldness and conviction of his own infallibility which are common to empirics, self-taught and half-learned men, who always have in their eye the public or private practical value of knowledge in common with the rigid followers and advocates of systems. As he thought that nothing could lie beyond the circle of his observation, he not only struck out what did not please him in the reviews which were sent to him, but altered them according to his fancy, and

often sent a sort of program to the reviewer to direct him as to the manner in which he wished a review to be drawn up. He himself relates all this in detail, and complains how much trouble and labour this superintendence had given him, for which no one thanked him. Whilst he thus imagined that he was to take the oversight of the public and to lead the spirit of the age, he was vehemently enraged when any manifestation of this spirit, which his understanding was incapable of reaching, particularly a deeper philosophy or a higher poetry, prevailed and triumphed without his aid. He never ceased to infuse into some dull novel the same sort of satire in which he had succeeded so well in his 'Sebaldu Nothanker,' which was written in a manner suited to the age, and was the means of making him its organ. In these miserable novels, in opposition to the spirit of the time, he ventured to ridicule all genius, every bold step in advance of himself, and every departure from Sulzer's rules. An æsthetic judgment upon Nicolai's novels will not here be expected from us. In reference to this and to all that follows, we must refer our readers to Gervinus' 'History of German Poetical Literature.' Our business is with the influence of books upon outward life, and the social directions which they indicate.

The first attempt which Nicolai made at a satirical novel was made in favour of the new age and in opposition to the old; it was made in favour of the small number of adherents to Frederick's principles among the citizens of Berlin, and it turned the whole system of Frederick William and its numerous adherents and defenders into irresistible ridicule. The proper power of the zealots was indeed broken; but official influence, pulpit swaggering, sighing and shoulder-shrugging made them yet powerful as a party among the people; and therefore Nicolai, in his usual broad tone of restrained satire, hits off the little accessory peculiarities of the party in a most admirable and effective manner. As a bookseller he gave a great charm to his 'Life and Opinions of Master Sebaldu Nothanker' by having it adorned with engravings from the hand of Chodowiecki, who was then greatly celebrated. In these illustrations all the well-known orthodox clergy of Berlin were sketched so as to be readily known by their gestures, their hat, their manner of wearing or taking it off, their cloaks and other peculiarities. The book, æsthetically speaking, was very little worth, and only served to make some of the most prominent orthodox men of a particular period and their follies a subject of passing ridi-

cule. Had its merits been greater, it would now again prove of great value, although the style, language and tone of the parties are changed. The book however is far more important to the inquirer about German customs, the relations of life and literature of the eighth decennium of the eighteenth century, than any other of Nicolai's novels, because all that relates to it lay completely within the narrow sphere of Nicolai's narrow circle of observation. The only matter of astonishment is that a fourth edition of 'Sebaldus' could have been called for in the year 1799, when everything was so completely changed.

In the second edition Nicolai makes it a matter of boast that his work had already been translated into Danish, French and Dutch, which by no means proves that it was excellent in itself, but only that those who were weary of the chaff of old dogmatism were desirous of using it as a means of ridiculing or exposing what they disliked. In this second edition (1774), he expressly declares that his object was not to write a political but an instructive novel,—not merely to relate events, but to show his zeal against fanaticism, superstition and hypocrisy. "My object," he says, "is merely to hold up to the laughter and contempt of the public the orthodox and hypocritical clergy of the protestant church, and to show that they make their own bad cause the cause of their office and of religion, or rather that of Almighty God himself,—to show that, when they make an outcry about prevailing errors, infidelity and blasphemy, they are only speaking of their own ignorance, hypocrisy and love of persecution, of the wickedness of their own hearts concealed under the mantle of piety. Unhappily," adds Nicolai, "these pretended watchmen of Zion do not bethink them that they make it but too evident, by their lamentable outcry, that they themselves belong to the too extensive family of the Stauziuses which is characterized in 'Sebaldus,' and only condemn themselves whilst they conceive they are pronouncing judgment on those whom they accuse."

Nicolai moreover characterizes himself, his manner and his judgment in matters of taste and of poetry, by introducing such a coarse book, as he himself describes it to be, in the words above quoted, in the form of the continuation of an easily written and licentious piece of pleasantry. 'Sebaldus' is to be regarded as a continuation of Von Thümmel's 'Wilhelmine,' and the hero is introduced as the husband of our old acquaintance. Nicolai's orthodox and his parsons, his president of the consistory, his Stauzius and Truffelius, are too strongly caricatured to justify us

in drawing any conclusions with respect to the spirit of the age from the sayings and doings of such persons. The second book of the first part is however, on the contrary, historically important as descriptive of Nicolai's personal views respecting the whole literature of his time, which he there describes, and upon which in the first part he had pronounced his judgment with all that boldness and presumption which were peculiar to him. It will be perceived, from the manner in which he considers everything as a bookseller and as to its outward value, what a bad condition our literature must have been in, as long as such a man, without either genuine philosophy or poetry, held unlimited dominion over it.

He gives a preference to the histories prepared or manufactured by Voltaire over the most learned German works, because the Frenchman, like every other manufacturer, only *brings that before the public which the public are anxious to buy*. On the same grounds he prefers Wolf's Logic in the German language, in which the art of thinking is taught like land-measuring, to the philosophy of Crusius, so much praised and recommended by Kant. In this division, as well as in the commencement of the following, in a dialogue upon bookselling, there are some admirable observations respecting learning and our German scholars, who were such as they still continue to be, and the relations of German literature to life, which are calculated to be useful even now. For these reasons we have mentioned this work in preference and to the exclusion of many others, which, if regard were had only to the history, to the plot of the novel, to satire, humour, or even to style and language, deserve to be ranked far above it. In the fourth edition of 1799, he ought to have altered or to have omitted much, if he had been desirous of making his vain judgments profitable to those who must have long forgotten the whole trumpery mentioned in the first edition, or who could rather never have been acquainted with it. Another satire against mawkish and courtly poetizing, against the fooleries of the Petrarchists and their representative J. G. Jacobi, was combined with that against orthodoxy and pietism. This kindled an unquenchable feeling of hatred between Nicolai and the vain brothers Jacobi. Nicolai ridiculed the love of fashion and that aping of rank for which F. H. Jacobi was remarkable, together with the mawkish sweetness and tenderness of the poet, J. G. Jacobi, without however naming either. The whole manner of life and conduct of J. G. Jacobi is delineated in the

third division of 'Sebaldus' under the name of Herr von Säugling, nephew of the honourable Frau von Hohenauf, and advantage was taken of the occasion to portray the whole fine and fashionable life of the Jacobis, as it was presented in Pempelfort and afterwards in Munich, and that too in a strain of bitter irony; so that whoever is desirous of becoming acquainted with the fashionable side of the then existing literature, and particularly with the mode of life among the Jacobis, must read these passages. Herr von Säugling, says the writer, has not much of the dust of the schools upon him; he understands however three European languages, has composed many poems on Phyllis and Doris, and sets no small value withal on his own little person.

This description of the nature and pursuits of the Jacobis is one of the best pieces in the whole of 'Sebaldus Nothanker,' for the fashionable, the flattering, the gallant, the idolizing of themselves and their dear kindred and acquaintances are all placed before the mind in bold relief; whilst the kindness of their disposition and the innocence of their harmless and vain self-admiration are not forgotten. However vehemently the Jacobis and their friends were excited by this characteristic description, it was far less malicious than his conduct towards the orthodox Berlin parsons, whose persons were not only known by Nicolai's description, but delineated in his engravings. Nicolai sets the principles of Von Rochow and the true services which he rendered to the well-being and morality of mankind, in opposition to the dogmatics and asceticism of these gentlemen. He introduces Von Rochow by name and extols his merits. Wieland was at this time as much embittered as Nicolai at the wilful obscurity of protestant theologians, and the affected and simpering tenderness of a certain class of writers of odes and songs about Platonic love, after the manner of Petrarch and Klopstock; he therefore praised 'Sebaldus' incidentally in his 'Mercury' (vol. ii., p. 231), and consequently gave offence to the brothers Jacobi, of whose assistance he had availed himself in his most recent speculations.

Wieland had formed a connexion with F. H. Jacobi, and by his aid had set up an organ for *polite* literature, such as Nicolai had established in the 'Universal German Library' for the *learned* department. Wieland disdained no kind of policy in order to secure a numerous class of readers for his literary productions, however inconsistent with his otherwise honourable character such a policy might be. In this respect he showed

himself a thorough south Swabian or Swiss, who never in any undertaking whatever loses sight of his real and substantial interests. This policy induced Wieland, still waiting for deliverance in the government office of his paternal state, to write to Riedel in the silly and exaggerated tone of exuberant friendship, which he was far from approving, and the same policy restrained him from entering into any alliance with Klotz and Riedel, and led him to attach himself to Jacobi. Wieland attained his object by a letter which contained the most fulsome adulation, and is characteristic of the tone in which those gentlemen, at that time, wrote to one another, and which they sometimes introduced into society: the same tone prevails in the correspondence between Wieland and Jacobi. Riedel moreover trumpeted the praises of Wieland, not only as the only great, as the only truly great man of his time, but he prevailed upon the governor of the town (Von Breidbach) to request the electoral prince of Mayence to release him from his engagements in Biberach, and to attach him to the new institution for education which was then being founded in Erfurt, and which was connected, though not incorporated, with the university in that place. We must here refer to this institution, as it belongs to the remarkable efforts and manifestations of that time, which was striving after mental culture and freedom of every kind more strongly and eagerly than after progress in the substantial interests of life.

By appointing a number of young men who did homage to the spirit of the age, the directors of this institution hoped to give the splendour of youth to the old and decaying Erfurt; and Riedel, who had then an unlimited influence upon the governor of the town, advised him to endeavour to make Wieland's name, then very celebrated, a means of attraction to students. Von Breidbach was even desirous at one time of placing Riedel and Wieland at the head of the whole institution. In addition to the two men who have been just named, Meusel, two Schmids, Schorch and C. F. Bahrdt were also called to take a part. A serious and sober man like Wieland was neither suited to the dissolute life of Riedel and Bahrdt, nor to that of their Mæcenas; for although it can scarcely be believed of the Swabian, who was not accustomed to the duties of a professor, Wieland performed his part well. He taught with approbation and applause, and was far more industrious than any of the others. He speedily attracted some hundreds of students, but

soon after found that he was not in his place in a German university, to say nothing of Erfurt, in the condition in which it then was, and among such a set of dissolute persons as were then assembled. He therefore willingly accepted the situation of tutor to the young duke of Weimar, afterwards reigning prince, and consequently removed to Weimar. Here he immediately formed the project (1772), as he himself admits, of making his family independent by means of his literary labours, and, alas! the whole of his future course as an author was guided by, and conformable to this project. His sensitive and visionary friend, Madame de la Roche, brought him into communication with F. H. Jacobi, and they corresponded with one another as Orestes and Pylades must have corresponded if they had written books.

The correspondence which Wieland and Jacobi carried on, after they had been introduced to each other by their sensitive friend, may be now read in print, and shows, as well as much of the printed correspondence of other learned men of celebrity, how wholesome it was for literature and society that the so-called geniuses of power, to whom Göthe at first attached himself, should rise up in opposition to the whining and whimpering of this real or affected sensibility. The dull and mawkish tone which prevails in these letters took root and became the fashion in all families which made any pretensions to education. The young were constrained to its adoption, and it must have led to all the meanness and evils of gross hypocrisy, precisely in the same way as the earlier pietistic and immoderately severe religious tone did. We see however that both these gentlemen, notwithstanding their sensibility, had calculated with diplomatical skill the value and influence of their journal upon *belles lettres*, by whose instrumentality they intended to bring their works, by way of specimens, before the public. Wieland was to give the benefit of his name, because he was a great favourite with the public, and Jacobi, who was in connexion with all the world, was not only himself to be a fellow-labourer and to secure others, but offered out of his own means to defray the expenses, and to make up a proper compensation to the contributors if the profits of the journal should prove insufficient. Wieland's name, which was used as a signboard for the 'German Mercury,' and Jacobi's writings, together with those of his brother, were to bear this flying Mercury into all corners of Germany. F. H.

Jacobi's half French education and cast of mind led him to borrow from Paris the name of his 'German Mercury,' as well as the tone which was to reign in it.

Jacobi writes, if not word for word, yet in spirit, as follows: he thinks that along with other French fashions introduced in order to raise the German people somewhat to a level with the French, an 'Almanack of the Muses' must also be transplanted into Germany, and introduced into the fashionable world as the Parisian 'Almanach des Muses' had already been, and that they should be presented with the 'Mercure de France' in the form and contents of a German journal. These are Wieland's own words, in an introduction to the first monthly part of the 'Mercury,' and Jacobi expressly said, in a passage of a letter to Wieland, which will be found below,* "The journal, like the French 'Mercury,' must be wholly adapted to ladies' toilette-tables, and for the use of perfumed gentlemen with yellow gloves." J. G. Jacobi was to be the poet of the magazine; Wieland was to furnish impure, and F. H. Jacobi artificial prose to the fashionable world. J. G. Jacobi, Klammer Schmidt and a number of others, of whom Gleim was the Mæcenas and Anacreon, were admirably suited to be toilette-table poets; but Wieland was by far too prudent to favour these poor imitators of Plato and Petrarch. J. G. Jacobi corresponded accurately with the likeness which Nicolai had drawn of him in his 'Sebaldu.' He was a most extraordinary favourite, from Halberstadt to Freiburg in the Breisgau, with all sensitive ladies, with all mawkish gentlemen, and in all circles in which tableaux were represented, puns perpetrated, and novels and poems read at the tea-table. Gleim had procured for him a canonry in Halberstadt, and there for many years he trifled and whimpered through many volumes of poetry, and died as late as 1813 in Freiburg. A critical review of these poems, which have in our century been collected, newly edited in many volumes, and which also undoubtedly found many admirers, does not belong to the province of this work; Gervinus' remarks upon them

* He says to Wieland (Letters, I. p. 67), 10th of August, 1772, that he would willingly take part in his scheme for establishing a book trade, and induce his brother and Gleim to do the same, for he stands in connexion with half the world; he adds, "The journal about which I wrote to you from Coblenz must be a thing like the French 'Mercury'; we must write it so as to make it interesting not only to the learned, but also to ladies, the nobility, &c."

must be read. It may suffice to say, that they are written in the style and manner of his loathsome, mawkish and sentimental correspondence with Wieland. Wieland therefore must have best known whether the picture of Jacobi and of the great family of the Von Hohenaufts in Germany, which was drawn by Nicolai in his 'Sebaldus' was true to nature or not. In Jacobi's correspondence with Wieland, printed a few years ago (1825), there prevails the same unnatural tone which makes the correspondence of Klopstock with his friends of both sexes wholly intolerable. If it be asked what was Jacobi's chief object, it may be said to have been style, which he, like Buffon, treated as a matter worth pursuing for its own sake; he had besides the ambition to be regarded as a dilettante. He was right, in the same sense as all those are right who can take delight in the bare and empty form. In this style there is always observable, what ought never to be observed in a true work of art, the incredible and unwearied industry with which he must have laboured in order to gain and to adopt, even to absurdity, the so-called academic style of the French school. In addition to style, Jacobi's chief department was something which was half poetry and half philosophy, but was intended to pass for the latter. This species of mongrel writing, and consequently his presumption and vain-glory, are easily explained from the course of his education and the nature of his associates.

Jacobi was originally half merchant half scholar, educated half by German reading and half by a French scholar and Genevese acquaintance; he became accidentally very rich, was well-disposed, kept a hospitable house at Pempelfort, was friendly and liberal, indescribably prepossessed in his own favour, but in no one thing peculiar. His family, his relations, his hangers on, his friends idolized him; they regarded him as a wonderful being, and in the intercourse of life he gave oracles with the same imposing majesty which he did in his books; everything natural had consequently become utterly strange, and art with him became nature. Wieland, who in his whole being and mode of life was thoroughly natural, simple and amiable, treated his friend Jacobi precisely in the same manner as he was accustomed to treat his mixed and artificial public. Their friendship only continued warm till the time in which Jacobi formed mystical friendships with Hamann, with the Stolbergs, Gallizin and others; but mysticism was so little in accordance with his

nature, that at a later period he easily cast off its shackles. In the early period of their connexion Jacobi communicated observations to Wieland upon style, and assisted him also to improve his 'Agathon.'

The idea of founding a German 'Almanack of the Muses' in imitation of the French, was first suggested to the two friends by the success which attended a similar imitation of the 'Almanach des Muses' in north Germany, which had been undertaken by Gotter and Boje (1772). The plan occurred to Wieland and Jacobi almost simultaneously, and quite independent of each other. Wieland, as well as Jacobi, intended to bring his writings first to the notice of the public in this monthly journal, and afterwards to publish them with greater safety and in an improved form. Jacobi's brother appeared at first a very suitable poetaster for the readers of the 'German Mercury;' but Wieland, who always kept a sharp eye upon the proceeds of the journal, soon perceived that his readers were of a very different class from those of the tender and sweet bard of the Weser and the Elbe, to whose labours he attached a very small value. This we learn from himself, in the very first number of the 'Mercury.' Jacobi's verses were printed in the first sheets, but Wieland added a postscript, which must have been anything but pleasant to the tender poet*. He also received very coldly the dull prose essay entitled 'Chamides and Theone, or upon the moral graces,' which runs through several of the succeeding numbers; so that both the brothers must have seen that his favourable and approving notice of 'Sebaldus,' accompanied with an express mention of Herr von Säugling, in the July number of the year 1773, was a formal disapproval of their fashionable sensibility. Both were greatly enraged. Frederick Henry threatened to break with him, and showed the weakness of that kind of philosophy of which he was proud, by regarding it as a personal insult to himself that Wieland should venture in any article whatever to speak in praise of Nicolai, nor was he ashamed to write this to him in express words†. Frederick Henry however found it best

* Page 13. "I do not wish the reader to regard these poetical trifles as the standard of what is to be expected from the 'Mercury' in this department. I not only hope, but can with certainty promise, that from time to time pieces of much greater excellence will be published."

† Letters, I. p. 125. "The unlimited praise which the 'Universal German Library' has received in the 'Mercury,' has been very offensive to me. You yourself, my dear Wieland, admit that my brother George's works have been

for his reputation, for which he was very anxious, to remain by Wieland, and Wieland on the other hand was glad that, by his expressions in the 'Mercury,' he had relieved himself from the necessity of admitting any more of the weak prose or dull verses of J. G. Jacobi into his journal. No happy union could be cemented between the Iris, the female messenger of the gods, who was patronized by J. G. Jacobi, and the manly Mercury, who was the winged and eloquent ambassador of Jove.

A difference moreover soon took place between Wieland and Nicolai. The latter became too presumptuous, and to do honour to his own religious views, which were such as are usually called deistical, he began in his own rude and severe strain to persecute and malign the religion of the people, and the philosophy of the olden times and of the eastern world, which it contains. For this purpose he employed a dull satire, like that of which he had availed himself in 'Sebaldus,' to expose and ridicule the domineering and stupid hypocrites whom he then attacked. In the quarrel which arose between Wieland and Nicolai, in consequence of the publication of this dull novel, which is scarcely deserving even of this appellation, both laid themselves completely open to the German public. In the course of this controversy, which took place in 1775, Wieland loudly proclaimed his dissatisfaction at the manner in which his books had been reviewed in the 'Universal German Library.' In the four volumes of 'John Bunkel's Life, Observations and Opinions,' Nicolai, with presumptuous boldness, ventured to place his own common and vulgar notions of religion, which may have been quite suitable to his domestic use, but were wholly crude and undigested, and mixed up with tasteless histories and stories, in opposition to the teachers of the Christian doctrine; and in so doing he adopted a Berlin citizen as his *ideal* of truth and perfection. Wieland seized upon this opportunity to call his attention to the fact, that all the world did not regulate their judgments as perhaps the people in Brandenburg and Pomerania were accustomed to do. In the course of a close examination of the nature and tendency of this miserable work, in the July, August and

spoken of in a most impertinent tone in this journal; but that is to say far too little. All that respect which is due to genius is there rudely trodden under foot. How severely is not the venerable Gleim treated! and the publisher openly calls Wieland a man of merit!" How contemptible! when people who wish to be thought philosophers spoke thus, what might not jurists do who ruled the press and the police in any aristocratical manner?

October numbers of the 'German Mercury' of 1778, Wieland, in an unbecoming tone indeed, which was contrary to his practice, not only condemned the book, but incidentally the author also, who had forced himself upon the attention of his readers with great forwardness and presumption. He revealed to German scholars the character of the man who at that time was the guide and guardian of literature. It is only when the printed explanations of these two poetical and industrious chiefs of the one side of German literature are carefully compared, that we first see how fortunate it was for Germany that the Göttingen bards, Göthe, Herder and Lessing, each took for himself another and a different direction. They both appear low and common, but in different ways. Nicolai endeavours to degrade the religious feelings of men and the speculations of a contemplative age to the worldly prudence of a common Berlin citizen, whose sole object is eating, drinking and sensual pleasures; and Wieland, who was so licentious in his poetry, plays a pitiful character as the defender of a system which was contaminated by Nicolai*.

Wieland and Jacobi however brought their 'Mercury' fortunately into the world: the former understood the best manner of bringing it before the public, with all the arts of a practised bookseller; and, what is more, in spite of all the trash he was obliged to receive into its pages, he knew how to uphold its reputation. J. G. Jacobi was not so fortunate with his 'Iris,' although his brother Frederic Henry supported him at first with an article, which perhaps belongs to the best of his works;

* The whole of the book here spoken of turns upon German life and the tone of social intercourse, together with the contemptible affairs of the kitchen and cellar. Wieland's attacks and Nicolai's replies and rejoinders must be read in the 'Mercury' and in the 'Universal German Library.' These were afterwards published together in a pamphlet (72 pp. 8vo.), Berlin and Stettin, 1779. Both trumpet forth their own writings and puff them off to the public, and neither is able to give a sufficient and satisfactory answer to the other. Nicolai's vulgarity lies in his whole manner; Wieland is ruder and more severe. The following may serve as specimens:—"This Bunkel is the shallowest, dullest and most impertinent book which ever sprung from the brain of a nonconforming triple compound of deism, pietism and epicurism, always prattling about stoical morality and living like an ill-begotten Bacchanal." Again:—"This Bunkel is a Christian deist, and his observations and opinions, filling whole alphabets of printed blotting-paper, are watery, cold, sophistical washings directed against certain articles of the Christian system which are hateful to him, of which there is not a single objection in opposition to the orthodox which has not, who knows how often? been already brought forward by him and his like," &c.

Göthe was also induced to condescend to the tea-table tone of the goddesses of the tender poet, and of his Olympus. Göthe also confided the productions of his muse to the messenger of the divine goddesses,—the tender ‘Iris.’ F. H. Jacobi published the first of his ‘Allwill’s Letters’ in his brother’s journal, but he wisely transferred their continuation to Wieland’s ‘Mercury,’ because the ‘Iris’ found no readers. Göthe, who aimed at being a master in every manner and style, wrote a drama for the ‘Iris,’ in order to insinuate himself into favour with its public. He afterwards published this drama in an improved form, after the fashion of Jacobi, under the title of ‘Edwin and Elmira, a musical play’ (Berlin, 1776).

In the same year in which Göthe brought his piece before the great public, which had been written for the small circle of the readers of the ‘Iris,’ there also appeared F. H. Jacobi’s poetical philosophical production in a complete form in several numbers of the ‘Mercury,’ whose commencement, under the title of ‘Allwill’s Letters,’ he had given in the ‘Iris.’ This work subsequently underwent so much correction and ornamenting, that the form in which it is now presented in his works bears scarcely any resemblance to its original one. These sentimental æsthetic letters, which were called philosophic, and were very celebrated in their day, are to be found in a new and completely changed form in the first part of the last edition of Jacobi’s works. We cannot indeed ascribe to this little book any influence upon the age, and that alone we keep always in view; but we may remark in passing, that the letter, in which a comparison is drawn between the fate of the unfortunate Louis the Sixteenth and that of Œdipus of Colonus, as described by Sophocles, appears to be the one most worthy of commendation. Jacobi’s second philosophizing novel appeared also at first by portions in the ‘Mercury.’ The work found readers, and was presently revised and altered; it furnished the materials for an ample criticism by Schlegel, which, like the book itself, has been long since forgotten. It presents a circumstantial view of the whole of the peculiarities of the Jacobi families,—their habit of self-tormenting about trifles, of seeking after pastimes, of magnifying every feeling and every expression, of idolizing one another,—all is there in the bright colours of reality. Jacobi and Wieland separated soon after the establishment of the ‘Mercury,’ in which both brought forward their works by portions to the public before

their appearance as a whole, as Mrs. Georges Sand does hers in the reviews. This separation was a consequence of the appearance of a new generation of poets and writers, who approximated more nearly to Jacobi than to Wieland.

§ III. B.

GÖTTINGEN BARDS.—IDYLLS.—SENSIBILITY.—TENDERNESS
IN GERMAN LIFE.—WERTHER.—SIEGWART.—CAMPE.—
SALZMANN.—PESTALOZZI.—NOVEL MANUFACTURIES.

About the time in which Wieland circulated Jacobi's works and his own in the pages of the 'Mercury,' and in which he fell into a strife with Nicolai about a bookselling speculation which both well understood, there sprung up in Germany (1773—1785) in all quarters a class of writers who announced a poetical view of life, whilst at the same time pietism and the wooden dogmatics of the sixteenth century were attacked in a much more serious and successful manner by Lessing than had been previously done by Nicolai. This period gave rise to a completely new science of taste, which was gradually formed, and even the universities and schools began to pay somewhat more attention to the demands which had been made good by the reformers of instruction, to whom two of the most learned and celebrated philologists, Simon and Schweighäuser, had attached themselves, and whose cause at a later period became victorious and was zealously promoted in Jena. The study of the ancient languages was more and more directed to their contents rather than to grammar and etymology, and the art of writing Latin was not so much practised merely for itself as for the improvement and perfecting of their native language, and that the forms of the ancient languages might be represented in the vernacular, so as at the same time to form the one language and penetrate more deeply into the spirit of the others. It is true, that in this process violence was often done to language, and the ear of the unlearned offended; but scholars soon perceived, that in Wieland's writings, who often dealt with the ancients in the same manner as the French had done before him, they only became acquainted with the shadow of antiquity, and sometimes not even with that.

Up till this time, of which we now speak, criticism and questions of taste had been handled by Ramler, Nicolai, Sulzer,

with great pretensions, and Ramler had corrected the poetry of his friends, which was often the pure and happy effusion of a momentary inspiration, as a schoolmaster is accustomed to correct the exercises of his pupils. Ramler adopted Batteux as his groundwork, Sulzer followed Wolf's principles as they had been applied to the fine arts and sciences by Baumgarten in Frankfort ; till Lessing took upon himself the department of eloquence and Winkelmann that of the arts. These two writers established a theory which was more favourable to genius and to the progress of poetry than the dry rules of the French Academy or the demonstrations of Wolf's philosophy. Lessing and Winkelmann drew their theories immediately from the only source of genuine and simple taste for the people of the German race, *i.e.* from the Greeks, whose organization was similar to their own. Lessing studied the ancient classics and Shakespeare with a view to his object ; Winkelmann examined and considered the remains of ancient art, and compared these remains with the language of the writers of antiquity. Both Winkelmann and Lessing exercised a most beneficial influence upon instruction, upon the higher schools and universities ; the former having been adopted as his guide by the celebrated critic and commentator Heyne. Their influence upon the higher schools was similar to that which Basedow, Wolke and the whole army of education men had produced upon a lower description of institutions, and upon domestic education, by their teaching and writings, and even by their mountebank tricks and their nonsense.

What Dessau, according to Basedow's plan, was intended to be for education and instruction in the practical departments of knowledge, as far as these are necessary to every educated man, Göttingen, through the instrumentality of Heyne, of the society which assembled around Boje, and of his 'Almanack of the Muses,' became for German poetry and the Gymnasiums. Heyne in his Seminarium formed teachers for the higher schools. Student life for a long time assumed a new and a better aspect, and Göttingen reached the summit of its renown at a period when a broad middle path between the ancient and the modern was sought for, and when prose writing and practical ability were universally and almost exclusively cultivated : it could not however long retain its reputation, when poetry and philosophy became exclusive objects of national concern. Michaelis first, then Pütter and Heyne, were at that time the oracles of the Hano-

verian ruling nobility. The nobles, from state policy, also took an interest in the intellectual movements in Germany, but all true inspiration was altogether as foreign, ridiculous or hateful to the one as to the other. They were only acquainted with, and influenced by, the usual university policy. The newly awakened nation no sooner began to be visionary, became intoxicated with a tumultuous joy at the freedom of mind at length won, than poetry, sentimentality, philosophy and enthusiastic fancy became universal, and the prosaic and practical business-like prudence of the Hanoverian nobles was out of its element, and Heyne's system of accommodation was no longer sufficient.

Heyne is entitled to be particularly named among the reformers of German life, mental improvement and instruction, because he accommodated Winkelmann's noble views of art, which were the fruits of exalted genius, to the comprehension of the Hanoverian and Saxon gentlemen who were desirous of travelling to Rome, or of distinguishing themselves as patrons of the arts. These and the whole fashionable world were formed and fitted for higher conversation by his archaeological lectures. His explanations of the ancients were also very serviceable to ordinary life. He accompanied his reading of the ancients with remarks, which often recalled to mind those of Minellius, pointed out their beauties in detail as he understood them, and became therefore often trivial; that however for the multitude, who are pleased to dwell on trivialities, was both agreeable and useful. In this manner he prepared and sent forth from his seminary whole swarms of teachers, who carried the light of the eighteenth century into the darkness of the seventeenth, wherever they were entrusted with the guidance or direction of the learned schools or gymnasiums of Germany. It is true that these teachers often weakened and diluted antiquity, and provoked the controversy which Wolf as well as Voss carried on with Heyne. This contest was also favourable to German improvement; for however much we must lament the vehemence and personality with which it was conducted, it is still obvious that the strife itself was calculated to advance the improvement of the nation and especially in classical studies. No school indeed was founded by Voss, and in spite of his vehemence no better mythology was taught by him than that of Heyne. The nation felt far less interested in the geography of Homer, as published and explained by Voss, than about his *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; these how-

ever became German poems by Voss' translation, and it is to be hoped they will ever continue to remain in the hands of the German youth, along with Luther's Bible. F. A. Wolf in Halle laboured with so much zeal and success against the shallowness and weakness which was current among Heyne's scholars, that by depth and solidity of learning, by severe critical and grammatical examination, he restored earnestness and strength to the study of the ancients, which had become somewhat too much regarded as an amusement. There were other teachers in Göttingen along with Heyne who also taught in the spirit of an age not favourable to mere dry and severe learning. Spittler and Plank showed what history ought to be, and that its mode of exposition, to be advantageous to the demands and wants of a generation striving after advancement, must be distinguished from geography, ethnography and genealogy, with which Gatterer especially occupied his time and attention; and from political economy, statistics, politics and the investigation of ancient records, to which Schlözer devoted himself. When Eichhorn came to Göttingen, he ventured to take a step in advance of Michaelis, and explained the writings of the Old Testament as the remnants of the Asiatic primitive ages, and not as a religious revelation like Christianity, or as a spiritual law. Accident at this time brought together a number of Klopstock's young friends at Göttingen, who in opposition to the will of their elders, to the practice of the universities, as well as the wish of the Hanoverian government, sought to bring forward free poetry and science as the philosophers had done in Jena since 1787.

These young and ardent men in Göttingen acknowledged Klopstock as their leader and model. Their aim was to divert the attention of the nation from stiff and pedantic knowledge to true elevated mental improvement, without external ornament; from servility and court bondage to freedom, independence and a national feeling; from bread studies and learned vanity to poetry, to inspiration for love, friendship, nature and religion without dogmatics. They were young and new in life, were yet acquainted with no philosophy which could have given sharpness and strength to their thinking and feelings, and were therefore sensitive. They also recognized Gleim's poetical school as their own, exaggerated their dislike to Wieland, who however had opened up the way for them and awakened the nation; they had a great dislike towards Nicolai, and were nevertheless

friendly to Ramler : all this may be explained from their youth and their poetic enthusiasm. It must be ascribed to the same reasons also that they regarded themselves as important before they had really become so, that they imitated Klopstock and his academical friends, and formed a sacred union from their friendly Göttingen meetings, as the others had done from their Leipzig associations. This union was celebrated in their poems under the name of the 'Union of the Groves,' as the others had done theirs.

It seems to us unnecessary to enumerate all the young men who, at that time, in Göttingen opposed a youthful and poetic life to that which had been the usual student life of the German universities ; there were however among them Hölty, Voss, the two Stolbergs, two Millers and Leisewitz, and the elder Boje joined them in a friendly spirit. Kästner, who had always been the opponent of his colleagues and their scourge, supported the first attempts of this our national poesy with his name, which was then equally renowned among mathematicians and the friends of poetical art. With Kästner's aid, the elder Boje, through the instrumentality of the 'Almanack of the Muses', introduced an entirely new generation of poets to the public. The history of the first 'Almanack of the Muses' of the Göttingen poets, and of all those who adopted their tone (which even Göthe did at first, however superior to them all he afterwards became), is as important for the history of our language and literature as that of the French Academy, the history of the Parisian and London saloons, and of the ladies who ruled in them and through them, is for that of the French. The middle classes of the nation, the burger circles which were then pure and moral, received an education and training which was not distinguished or exaggerated, but which was well suited to the relations of life in which the Göttingen poets and their Claudius was born. This was also kept in view by the Stolbergs ; courtiers like von Thümmel and Wieland, and the geniuses of later years struck a somewhat free and licentious chord for the higher and dissolute circle of court idlers.

Bürger could not be properly said to belong to the allied poets in Göttingen, who were chaste and pure in their lives, and who acknowledged the sensitive poet of the Messiad as their instructor, leader and head, although he received a friendly greeting from them as a poet. He had had the misfortune to be pro-

tected in Halle by Klotz, and to have been incorporated with the swarm of his clients, and was therefore in some measure addicted to that scandalous course of life which Klotz and his friends were accustomed to lead. By this means the nation was defrauded of the only man who proved, by the specimens which he gave, that he was the only man among them all who would have been able to have gained over the people in masses to the love of poetry. The indulgence was reserved for Göthe alone to belong at the same time to the pure and the impure, because his godlike genius could awaken every chord. At a later period he composed an 'Iphigenia,' wrote 'Werther,' 'Elective Affinity,' and other artificial novels for the small Saxon courts; he was all things to all men, whilst the individual Göttingen poets were only each in his way fitted for certain neighbourhoods, conditions of life, races, circles and states of society; but that was infinitely important for Germans.

It is the less necessary for us to do more than give a very short notice of the single poets of the Bard union, and of much which is connected with the sphere of their influence, because there are two works, both lately published, from which a much fuller detail may be had than space here permits us to give*. These works contain an æsthetic examination of the productions themselves; we can only touch upon a few points, which are external, and only mention individuals, not them all, to whom the nation is unspeakably indebted in relation to life and general culture and improvement. The two Stolbergs have never had either a national influence or name, although their poems, like those of a hundred others, good indeed, but not exactly great, have been much read and given great pleasure; they failed to exercise a public influence, partly because they went a little beyond the circles of ordinary life, and partly because, at a later period, they assumed quite a different tone from that in which they had at an earlier period written; we must therefore be careful, in their writings, to distinguish the different periods at which they appeared. We should not mention J. M. Miller of Ulm at all as a poet, if he had not obtained a greater influence upon the circles of middle life and their general tone than any of his poetical friends, by means of a novel. We shall here-

* Prutz: Göttingen Bard Union, for the History of German Literature. Leipzig. Wigand, 1841. See the last volume of Gervinus' 'History of German National Poetry.'

after show that his mediocre production was grafted upon a clever work of Göthe, which was altogether misunderstood by his contemporaries, and which completely weakened the tone of the tender souls who had been already enervated by the Klopstock Petrarchists, while Miller accommodated the high poetical flights of Göthe by this melancholy prose to the proper degree of intelligibility for awakening the sensibilities of the daughters of our parsons, placemen, apothecaries and tradespeople of the first rank.

Hölty and Voss were both, only in different ways, poets of the rural and domestic life of the middle classes of north Germany, which often at that time presented a combination of lively and tender feelings with very simple or perhaps even poor circumstances, as was the case with Voss himself in his first entrance upon housekeeping. Hölty possessed much more than Voss of that old Scandinavian and German element of melancholy, which Macpherson, in his 'Ossian,' attributes to his Scots, and even Homer acknowledges (when, he uses the well-known expression, there is a joy also in benumbing sorrow*); Voss adopted, from the ancients in general, and from Homer in particular, not the dark but the clear side of life, and hence his disinclination to the East, and his warm and bright views of life. Hölty with his Scandinavian melancholy feeling was far nearer than Voss to the oriental Christian, and to us other northern Germans, who, although we feel a repugnance to dogmatics, yet cherish an earnest feeling of the nothingness and transitory nature of all our labours and pursuits. Voss, on the contrary, with his idylls of ordinary life, stood nearer to Rousseau. He accommodated his songs and idylls to the circle in which he lived, and again, when he became rich enough to live somewhat better, he made his own life and that of his friends conformable to his idylls. Voss was therefore honoured and idolized by one portion of the people, especially by those who were neither romantic nor humorous, but mistook all sorts of irregular cross and somerset leaping and rope-dancing for marks of genius, whilst he was despised by persons of real genius. It was neither observed by the one party nor by the other, that he remained quite unacquainted with philosophy, properly so called, *i. e.* with a capacity of sounding the tendencies and inward nature of things, that he could neither rise above the middle heights of poetry nor estimate the

* Odyss. iv. 102, 103.

poetical, symbolical and philosophical spirit of Christianity; on the contrary, however, he was great in his sphere, and within that sphere must continue so to be.

Besides, whatever may be thought of Voss's capacities as a poet, his influence upon our nation remains always the same, as every one in the preceding century must have remarked and experienced, if not precisely in the same manner as we have; of this influence we are only speaking, and questions of taste do not come under consideration. Whether Voss be praised as a poet, or severely censured, as he is by many, whether his conception and description of life in his poems and idylls be regarded, as it usually was in our youth, as true and genuine, or be despised as prosaic and boorish, as the custom has been since the times of the transcendental philosophy and its daughters,—the romantic and the ingenious, the historical result as a fact remains undeniable. By the agreeable deception of a species of poetry which was suited to their minds and circumstances, he reconciled the middle classes and families with very narrow incomes to their destiny, he taught them in idea to exalt and magnify their apparently miserable enjoyments, and to sweeten their severe privations to themselves and their families according to Campe and Salzmann's guidance, by an exaggeration of feeling and expression which we often ridicule as sentimental or laugh at as vulgar. Life became lighter and more cheerful by having poetry brought nearer to its prose, and the way was rather opened for a higher species of poetry than barred against its admission. Voss indeed, with quite as much exclusive insolence as his opponents displayed towards him, would not admit that it was possible, in a more stirring and many-sided life, to present another kind of poetry than that with which he was acquainted: he therefore often fought with windmills.

The poems to which Voss owed his first reputation, and even his 'Luise', which was the production of a later period, have only a conditional value; on the other hand, he gained imperishable renown for the service which he rendered to the German language and art of poetry by his translation of the two great epics of Homer; in this field all who come after him have only gleanings to gather. By his translation Voss rendered the same sort of service to our nation, with respect to language, versification and modes of thinking, as Luther has rendered by his translation of the Bible, because his perception and feelings bore

the same relation to the Homeric as Luther's mind to that of the Prophets and Apostles.

Since the time in which Voss performed the task of accurately transferring into the German language the verse, language and sense of Homer, although not without occasional violence and some appearance of foreign modes of expression, scholars can do without sapless and pithless commentaries; they need only lay together Wolf's text and Voss's translation, and have learned their grammar well, in order immediately to seize upon and comprehend the spirit of the Homeric poems. The young, if they had poetic talents, were urged to the study of the Greek by the difficulty which, from the very sounds of the languages, always attaches to translation, however admirably it may be performed, in order to be able to compare language with language, and the original form with its modern representation. Our great poets, especially Göthe and Schiller, were impelled to the study of Greek precisely by what Voss had done, and Göthe in particular saw (for Schiller in reference to measure and quantity was always inattentive and relied too much upon rhyme) how important the structure of the verse and the quantity of the syllables must be, even to the greatest poet.

The Stolbergs shared the merit with Voss of introducing the ancients into the circle of German life, although their deserts were rather of a different kind, because they preferred a method of transferring the language and spirit of the ancients into German, which lay between that which Wieland had selected and the severe accuracy of Voss. They selected the tragedians, but they neither sought, like Voss, to create a new language, to imitate the measure in the minutest particulars, nor to construct an edifice after the example of the original accessible to the learned alone, to the exclusion of the uninitiated. They therefore gave some ideas of Greek poetry to those to whom Voss appeared too difficult and too rough, without robbing the original of all its peculiarities, as was done by Wieland and the French. We do not at all direct attention to the other numerous translations which Voss at a later period made, because they had no influence in awakening the German people to a new life, and of that alone we are now speaking. One remark however we cannot avoid making, with something of the feeling that in some of his later translations the scholar has supplanted or rather clogged the poet. From the institution of the 'Almanack

of the Muses' the nation had obtained original poets enough ; it was therefore a labour worthy of the translator of Homer to endeavour to make our language more figurative and flexible, as it was capable of becoming, and at the same time to resist and contend against that superficial study of the ancients to which Heyne's scholars were too favourable.

Claudius belongs to the same class of poets in which we place the Göttingen friends. He lived for some time with Voss in Wandsbeck, and like him preferred the humble, social, and domestic circle to the sluggish life of the great world. He will probably continue to be dearer to the nation by his single songs, and perhaps also as a good-natured religious visionary, than Voss, because the latter wrote more in the spirit of the age, —Claudius more in the spirit of that kind of religious feeling which has a deep root among the people. When we call to mind Claudius' songs upon Rhine wine, and his 'How is the world so still,' we immediately perceive that the Christian religious character and the pure nature which speak forth in him, must always be acceptable to those of us who do homage to another philosophy than that of Claudius, amongst children and the people at large. This field is a very narrow one ; Claudius soon exhausted it, and imagined that he was witty and clever, when he was obliged to become constrained and mannerized. His witticisms indeed might please a certain class of readers for a considerable time in such a journal as the 'Wandsbeck Messenger,' but they could have no permanent influence.

Claudius had the less influence upon the rapid development of the mental progress of our people, because, as early as 1775, he had declared war against every step in advance, and ceased to write either clearly or intelligibly, and for these very reasons he contracted an intimate friendship with Hamann. From the time in which he received St. Martin's book into his hands and translated it, he sank into the tasteless mysticism of the so-called Martinists, which was characterized by the bitter opposition which it offered to the exercise of a reasonable understanding, to the cheerful and innocent enjoyments of life, and to all sorts of instruction from without.

Claudius and Hölty moreover stand in the closest relation to that species of sensibility which overran Germany like a typhus, the rapidity of whose diffusion was greatly promoted by one of the Göttingen bards, J. Martin Miller, of Ulm. We are here obliged

to introduce some notice of the novel, in other respects very mediocre, by means of which this effect was produced, not from any value of its own, but as a symptom and cause of this reigning sensibility. Miller's novel, of which we shall hereafter speak, would not have had the astonishing effect which it produced upon our youth, even as far as the coasts of the Northern Ocean, and in that time of prevailing sensibility among tender striplings and the female sex, had it not been preceded by a masterpiece of Göthe, of the same character. Miller's 'Siegwart' was a kind of translation of 'Werther' into the language, feelings and manners of that portion of the public which belonged to the Petrarch and Klopstock schools, a prose composition after the fashion of the poetry of 'Werther;' and to the latter therefore we must first direct our attention.

Göthe opened his career (1772) contemporaneously with the Göttingen bards, but kept himself apart and independent of all parties, however attractive they might be. Every one was surprised that one individual, among all the innumerable poets of the age, and in a very few years after his first appearance on the theatre of public life, should be unanimously acknowledged, and in all parts of Germany, although in very different ways, as the greatest mind of the nation and its most brilliant hope. After the innumerable books which have been written with respect to his history and writings, both in Germany and in foreign countries, we may fairly take it for granted, that these are already well known, and a few indications on our part will be sufficient. His smaller poems and writings, his personal acquaintance with the most distinguished men of young Germany, to whom also Schlosser, Herder, Basedow, Möser and Moser, Jung-Stilling, who was brought forward by Göthe himself, and Lavater belonged, early directed the public attention towards him, and he was already in the enjoyment of a high reputation, when his 'Götz von Berlichingen,' which he had at first printed at his own expense, suddenly threw all Germany into commotion.

'Götz von Berlichingen,' as may be seen from Voss's Letters, was greeted by the Göttingen bards as a great light in the midst of thick darkness, as the commencement of an entirely new period of German dramatic poetry. The young friends of nature, of Homeric simplicity, and of Greek heroics probably also hoped, that the man who had written 'Götz von Berlichingen' would enter the lists and struggle along with them against the

Berlin criticism and æsthetics, and against the gallo-grecism of Wieland. The idyllic poets were convinced that the false ornaments and licentiousness of courtly language and verse would disappear before the truth and sternness of life, which Göthe was anxious to bring upon the stage. Göthe had already spoken his thoughts upon Wieland's manner of dealing with the Greeks, with somewhat too much freedom and authority, but in a witty and somewhat violent pasquinade, entitled 'Gods, Heroes and Wieland,' to which his friend Lenz gave publicity against his will. In this essay he took advantage of the appearance of Wieland's 'Alcestis' to ridicule the abuse which Wieland in this opera, as well as elsewhere, made of antiquity, which was always travestied by him. The effect of 'Götz von Berlichingen,' and of the ridicule which it cast upon the want of vigour that appeared in all the imitators of the French, was immediately visible. There arose in Germany, and in the very midst of the rigid pedantry of the learned, a number of young men who raised a vigorous opposition against all sentimentality, and by means of the life and death struggle which they carried on against the Berlin criticism and Ramler's rules, against the poetical schools of Gleim and Klopstock, against the licentiousness of Wieland and German pedantry in general, and even by their very exaggerations, became in the highest degree useful to German mental improvement and to the copiousness and compass of their literature.

The aristocratic magistrates of our imperial free cities, the stiff courts, the pedantic universities, the despotic officials, and the various chanceries which continued to protocol and decree in all the obscurity and in the style of the seventeenth century, were filled with no ordinary apprehensions, when, in spite of their police and their gravity, an ultra-liberal generation of writers was threatening to spring up, who disdained all rules, decrees, and discipline as things which were become old-fashioned. This generation is usually distinguished by the name of the "geniuses of power," and a full account of their aims, tendencies and pursuits may be learned from Gervinus' 'History of German Poetic Literature.' Among the persons who are reckoned in the list of these geniuses, Lenz, who had already shown some tendencies to madness, and Klinger, who, at a later period, poured out all the fullness of his worldly wisdom in some admirable novels, now understood by few, made some attempts in the dramatic depart-

ment, and others in other ways. There is however no playroom for genius in the narrow limits of small town German life (perhaps happily for our nation), and we therefore touch upon the whole question of those writers distinguished by their higher genius and humour with so much the lighter hand, as Gervinus has treated the whole subject at length and in an admirable manner.

Not only the direction of these so-called geniuses of power, and the voice of the age, by which their efforts and exertions were called forth, had found a representative in a poetical production of the great national poet, but he even mastered and identified with his mind every occurrence or act, which made a strong impression upon the minds of his contemporaries and friends. This was the case with Beaumarchais, with his 'Journey to Spain,' and with the adventures which he there achieved, and of which the whole world was full. Immediately after the appearance of 'Götz von Berlichingen,' Göthe took occasion to write another piece of a completely opposite kind, and by no means in the Shakesperian manner, or even in that of a genius. As to Beaumarchais himself, he was at that time the fashion; he had been fortunate in Paris, shone in society by his talents and wit, possessed a share in a banking concern, and became a friend of Franklin, because the French government had used him as their instrument to hand over their subsidies to the Americans, before they had openly declared themselves in their favour. At a later period he became an object of universal attention, in consequence of his comedies, his pleas, which were formal satires, and by his fate. By the fragment of 'A Journey to Spain,' which F. H. Jacobi had worked up in German and published in the second number of the seventh volume of Wieland's 'German Mercury,' he had excited general attention among the educated public in Germany, as he had previously done in France. Göthe availed himself of the attention which all these things awakened in the public mind, to seize upon them as the subject of a drama, and he was right, for a drama can only make an impression when the poet understands how to profit by the prevailing feelings of the public; thus 'Clavigo' had its origin.

Göthe borrowed the materials of his 'Clavigo' from Beaumarchais, and worked out the plot with as much and as careful regard to all the rules of art, as in 'Götz von Berlichingen' he

had given free course to the inspiration of his genius, and had utterly done despite to all rules both in plot and expression. The German public was not a little astonished that one and the same poet, in such close succession, could satisfy the admirers of Shakespear's superiority to rule, and again could please the friends of the French stage. The historical and French origin of 'Clavigo' is indeed apparent from the long speeches, and the manner in which, contrary to history, a tragical issue is given to the piece; it was not however the design of the poet to construct a tragical masterpiece from the materials, but only a good piece. The same remark may be made with regard to the two pieces which he wrote after the manner of J. G. Jacobi; this was done, probably half in earnest, half in jest, in order to prove that something may be made of every manifestation and direction of the public voice, if a truly great mind is disposed to take advantage of it.

'Erwin and Elmira' and 'Stella' were excellently adapted to the circle which Nicolai ridicules in his 'Sebaldus,' to the Herrn von Hohenaufts, to their lady dames, their parsons and officials, to all those tender-feeling souls who admired the fondling endearments, whose sweet singer Hölty has satirized in his well-known 'Beggarmen's Ode,' after the manner of Petrarch*. In close connexion with these pieces, or at least with the spirit of the age from which they sprung, stands Göthe's masterpiece, which was altogether misunderstood in its time, but which is the triumph of the German language, in which our prose, blamed as harsh and rough, and remarkable only for its vigour, becomes soft and mild, like a gentle breathing,—we refer to the 'Sorrows of Werther.' This work appeared in 1774, and was obliged to be reprinted in the following year. It was certainly no fault of the poet, that from this moment forward the troubled, sensitive, melancholy tone of certain German circles so rapidly increased. The time, as Göthe himself has strikingly observed, was not yet capable of conceiving a prose work of art merely as such, *i. e.*

* Jacobi's song, which is contained in the opening of the 'German Mercury,' begins:—

“ Wenn in leichten Hirtenkleide
Mein geliebtes Mädchen geht.”

The parody is found in the 'Wandsbeck Messenger,' and begins,—

“ Wenn in leichten Huthfilzsöckchen
Meine braune Trutschel geht.”

without making either moral requirements or an application to the history of particular times and places, as it is the custom to apply moral histories for the benefit of children.

Göthe indeed furnished some grounds for the misunderstanding, by availing himself of accidental events, as he did in the case of 'Clavigo,' and frequently besides, in order to identify his poetry with some definite time and place, with neither of which it had any more connexion than the immortal spirit of man has with its mortal tenement, which, viewed from without, is its representative and organ. The suicide of young Jerusalem (son of the Abbot), who was at that time studying law in Wetzlar, and was well known to every one in the respectable families through the whole of the Wetterau and in Frankfort, had excited an extraordinary degree of public attention, because an unhappy attachment to a married lady was said (and probably without reason) to have been the cause of the melancholy event. Hegel's friend Hölderlin, no empty vain fellow (Bursche) like Jerusalem, but a poet and a philosopher, as is well known, became deranged, at the close of the century, from a similar cause.

The noble and splendid poetry of Göthe at this time caused his 'Sorrows of Werther' to be received not merely as a novel of the ordinary kind, but as a poetic representation of real circumstances, and this also was the reason why his work had so mighty an influence on the public mind, as leads us to place it here in connexion with 'Siegwart.' Both books contributed to make the very prosaic life of the middle classes at the same time ridiculous and sorrowful. The new education and the writings of its promoters had laboured to give life something of a pastoral character, and Voss and his friends, in their poems, represented it as if it were really such. The 'Sorrows of Werther' and 'Siegwart' were similar in their effects,—externally they were completely alike, but they were as different in reality as nature is different from affectation. In 'Werther' love appears as a powerful and irresistible passion, which seizes upon a weak mind and drives it hither and thither at its will. This passion, which is represented in connexion with idealized, common-life relations, is exhibited more distinctly in all its directions and forms, and becomes an outward thing, because the form of letters has been chosen for its vehicle, which allows the weak mind to develop itself before us in speech and action, after it has been tossed and blown about by the storm of overruling passion. And it is pre-

cisely because the soul was neither strong nor great, and could in no respects be held out as a model, that it was finally completely shivered.

This was not at all suspected, and general readers did not admire the incomparable form, the easiness and flow of language, and the power of passion, which can be remarked in a weak mind alone, because a great one triumphs over it; but, on the contrary, all such weak minds were exalted to heroes and martyrs, and in this silly manner young Jerusalem was identified with Göthe's Werther. Lotte became an historical personage, pilgrimages were made to Werther's grave, and the practice of realizing and identifying every person and every word in the novel proceeded to an extent which no one can conceive who did not live in those times, or who is not able in the spirit of impartiality to recognize as such similar extravagances in our own. The infectious and absurd extravagance which found its nutriment in 'Werther' and 'Siegwart' has long fled; no one thinks of Siegwart any more, and whoever reads it, feels compassion for a whole generation who could possibly have been moved by such whining; but, alas! we have been hardened and made insensible to the 'Sorrows of Werther' by the 'Elective Affinity' and 'Wilhelm Meister' of Göthe's later and aristocratic time. It must, however, still be regarded as an incomparable work of art, in which a passion, in itself altogether senseless, and an insignificant being have received poetic importance and value by a poet who did not as a cold artist create a mere objective work, as is usually said, or rather who was not then dead to the inspiration of true love and friendship, or sunk into egotism by intercourse with the world, and by a residence in courts.

The reception which this great work of art experienced from the sensitive sex shows how far behind other nations Germany then was, and how much our country has gained at a later period in Göthe and Schiller, in the new philosophy and the Schlegels, as long as they worked with revolutionary zeal in Jena in favour of a new literature. Göthe himself has best expressed the total want of all true inspiration, the utter incapacity of conceiving a purely mental poetical creation, as such, which the generation that was educated according to the principles of Salzmann, and moved by the idylls of Voss, exhibited on the occasion of the publication of the 'Sorrows of Werther'; and we expressly dwell upon 'Werther' and 'Siegwart,' because

we can find no more suitable occasion of presenting easily and at the same time sensibly to the eye of the public the real inward condition of the circle of educated persons as it existed at that time. In that passage of Göthe's life in which he speaks of the truly comical excitement which the publication of the 'Sorrows of Werther' had raised among those who were wholly unable to form any idea of a work of art, and of the misunderstandings which existed upon the subject of the injuries thereby done to the cause of religion, which prevailed among the orthodox in Hamburg and the heterodox in Berlin, he says:—"It is not to be expected from the public, that it should intellectually receive a purely intellectual work. The contents and materials were alone taken notice of, as I had already heard from my friends, and then came again into play that old prejudice which arises from the conceived dignity of a printed book, viz. that it must have some didactic object. True representation has none: it does not approve, but developes modes of thinking and actions in their consequences, and thereby enlightens and instructs."

Because these misunderstandings about Göthe's work exhibited themselves in the most various forms in various writings, the condition of German enlightenment at that time, and the limited capacity of the rulers of literature even to understand genuine poetry, may be best shown by some allusions to these writings. We shall, however, for brevity's sake, only refer to those misunderstandings and their modes of manifestation. The orthodox old Lutherans condemned the book as they would have condemned a sin; the prosaic and genuine citizen, and the Berlin dry philosophers, as an erroneous moral doctrine; and finally, the tender and weak souls sympathized with Werther, because they took him for one of themselves. Two of these directions of the public mind, thus loudly expressed on this occasion, still exist,—the orthodox and the dull practically moral,—and they again present themselves in all corners and ends of Germany, in which the old is again springing into life under new forms; the third, after having experienced all the alterations and changes of times, is divided into several branches, in proportion as one or other philosophy rules in the various subjects which are comprehended under it.

All the believers in the old system, the pastors, the juridical theologians like Pütter, the consistories, the magistrates of the imperial cities, who were at that time numerous, looked upon

such new poetry, as that which was contained in 'Werther,' as the germ of destruction, and upon its diffusion as a storm against Lutheranism, and consequently against the existing constitutions in church and state. Pastor Melchior Götze in Hamburg had long put himself forward as the unreasonable organ of these conservatives. Götze's crusade against the 'Sorrows of Werther' is however especially worthy of notice for our purpose, because the case connected with it shows us how energetic was the youthful struggle and the noble vigour of the few but firmly united friends of light, which then began to dawn in Germany. The united mass of above-named zealots and Götze, with the standard of the aggrieved Zion at their head, stirred up the people, which were then blind, but now see, and it raged. The police of cities and princes was hostile to the new light, and yet the cause of knowledge remained victorious; we do not therefore despair, although the watchmen of Zion again cry aloud. Melchior Götze had scarcely become aware what an indescribable effect the new novel, in which the suicide of young Jerusalem, according to his opinion, was praised as a deed of heroism, had made upon the people, and especially upon those classes of gentlemen and ladies who were in the highest degree despised by him, who would rather read books upon self-murder than his sermons or Benjamin Schmolke's prayer-book, or the swarthy newspapers of his friend Ziegra. He was no sooner conscious of all this, than he immediately issued a sort of pastoral letter against 'Werther,' as the Archbishop of Paris had formerly done against Rousseau's 'Emile.'

The title of this charitable address, which the holy man, prompted by his holy zeal, published to the world, runs as follows:—"Short but necessary admonitions with respect to the sufferings of young Werther, in reference to a review of the same and certain succeeding essays" (1775). From this address we may learn to what the pious rage of zealots leads, and the manner in which blind Lutheran orthodoxy deals with the poetry and literature of the nation, when it has changed religion into a mere mechanical service and into a work of the memory; and it is useful in these times to call such topics to recollection. In order to illustrate this, we shall select the few sentences with which the pastor closes his address. He cries out:—"In the midst of the evangelical Lutheran church, apologies for suicide appear, and are praised by the public press; we may soon ex-

pect to see *Laudes Sodomiae*, at least new editions, or perhaps even translations of the ‘*Aloysa Sigæa*.’ It will be regarded as no crime to remove others who stand in our way. The art of mixing poisons will be so understood and arranged that its punishment will become impossible,” &c. In order, moreover, to show with what coarseness, with what sophistry, religious enlightenment was skilfully represented as a political offence, we add, that Götze, after having through several sentences thus represented Göthe as a seducer of the people, a corrupter of morality and enemy of the police, finally places Semler in the same category. “In short,” he says, “when the Holy Scriptures are trodden under foot according to the principles of Semler, or modernized after the practice of Bahrdt, so as to be made offensive and absurd, what will Christendom become?—a Sodom and Gomorrah.”

In order to show that it was not the mere powerless outcry of a blind priest, we must state that the theological jurists of the imperial cities, and all those who stood at the head of the state police, took part with the representative of the Lutheran conservative party. Such men, viz. as Merk, Schlosser, Göthe (and, alas ! Bahrdt also), at that time sent contributions to the Frankfort ‘*Learned Notices*’ without devoting much attention to their labours, or laying great stress upon them. One of the contributors had noticed Götze’s devotional considerations in a somewhat offensive and contemptuous manner, whereupon the Frankfort magistrates expressed their indignation against the journal, and thought themselves bound to restrain or suppress it. The gentlemen of the Frankfort council were so full of respect for the ‘*Hamburg Watchman*,’ that they not only of their own mere motion punished the publisher, but declared themselves as decidedly opposed to every attempt to raise up a young Germany, in the following words ; “that there were traces in those ‘*Notices*’ of a highly scandalous and offensive zeal against all those duties which were due to the state and to religion.” But their state policy in favour of Lutheranism and its representative did not end here,—“severer rules were to be adopted as a precaution ; and all reviews touching upon theological subjects were to be strictly forbidden.” Götze was so touched at the harmony between his theology and the Frankfort police, that he wrote a special letter of acknowledgment and thanks to the Bur-

gomaster and Council of Frankfort, in which he assures them,—
“ It is clear to the whole world, from these regulations, that the true God yet reigns in the Frankfort Zion.”

Nicolai had long stood at the head of the other large and still extending party of Germans, who were dallying upon the broad highways of the prosaic morality of ordinary burger life, and dealing in poetry and philosophy. He exercised as complete a popish jurisdiction as Götze did in Hamburg at the head of the old Lutherans. Nicolai and his ‘ Universal German Library,’ were the oracles of taste and of criticism in Hanover, Brandenburg, in Saxony, and in all parts of Germany, where Wieland was regarded as the first of our classic poets ; but Nicolai also deceived himself with regard to his influence upon his limited circle of admirers, who were not so completely blind as Götze’s followers. On the appearance of the ‘ Sorrows of Werther,’ Nicolai also published his pastoral letter against the work, which letter he meant to be regarded as a satire, but even his friends considered it to be, what it really was, a mass of dulness and stupidity. It was entitled, ‘ Joys and Sorrows of the Young Werther’ (1775). This attempt to travesty the history of ‘ Werther’ in a vulgar manner by a ridiculous and very dull catastrophe, was so completely unsuccessful, that the prudent speculator, in order not to lose the favour of his readers, was obliged to confess in his own notice of his parody, that he had gone beyond the limits of reasonable criticism. Wieland, although he had been previously offended by Göthe’s offensive pasquinades, and although he was more nearly connected with Nicolai than with Göthe, knew well, even on this occasion, how to distinguish the great poet from the common herd of ordinary sentimental novel-writers. Göthe, therefore, may well be pardoned for having given way to his cynical humour in answer to Nicolai’s essay, which, as the latter said, was composed for the protection of morality. Göthe’s poetical and satirical answer was entitled, ‘ Nicolai at Werther’s Grave.’ In his announcement of his remarks in the ‘ Universal German Library,’ Nicolai himself expressly asserts, that they contain no satire upon Göthe, whom he respects and acknowledges as a master, but that he only intended to ridicule and expose the mournful and sensitive tone of the work, and the kind of defence of self-murder which it contained. He takes advantage of the opportunity indeed to state, that the

articles in the 'Frankfort Journal' had been very offensive to him, in which the lantern light of Berlin, as well as the Hamburg darkness, were satirized with severity.

We regard J. M. Miller, of Ulm, as the representative of the blind direction of the age, of the sentimentality, tenderness of the innumerable men who thought they understood Göthe because his style was easy, but who at the same time were completely unacquainted with the spirit of his writings. Like Hahn, Leisewitz, and Hölty, he belonged to the Göttingen bards, and wrote very pretty poems; we would however neither refer to these, his other works, nor even to 'Siegwart,' if we did not think ourselves obliged to show in what way, that which had been an idyllic tone, and the description of domestic scenes in Göttingen, came as a species of fanaticism into Swabia, and by means of 'Siegwart,' was disseminated through the whole of Germany. 'Siegwart, or the story of a Monastery,' which Miller had written in 1775, when he returned from Göttingen to Ulm, is carefully to be distinguished from his later novels, which he merely manufactured for sale. Among the latter we reckon his 'Correspondence of three Academical Friends,' 'Carl von Burghheim,' 'Emilie von Rosenau,' &c. 'Siegwart' was unquestionably indebted to the 'Sorrows of Werther' for its success, and for the attention which it excited, and yet it would be a great mistake to regard the one as an imitation of the other. They were called forth by the same spirit of the age, but 'Siegwart,' much more than 'Werther,' belonged to the Göttingen elegiac direction: it must therefore be regarded as an elegiac idyll of a poet, who was formed among the Göttingen bards.

This novel of Miller's, which produced an indescribable sensation, was circulated through the remotest corners of Germany, on the coasts of the North Sea and on the banks of the Weser, in places the most distant from Swabia. In our youthful days, the "Hast thou ceased to suffer? Hast thou wrung out all thy tears," &c., were questions in the mouths of the whole female sex among our country-people, who were then somewhat rough and rude, but visionary and fanatical. It was based wholly upon the north German idylls, and upon that melancholy tone which had been awakened by Hölty and other poets, and was re-echoed by the people. The same tendency appears in all Miller's poems, in his idylls, elegies, and songs, which we perceive in 'Siegwart;' and it was this very circumstance, the voice of the

times ruling and speaking by him, which made him such an object of personal affection to Voss and other Göttingen friends, who were no admirers of melancholy and fanaticism, and to whom a cloister was as hateful as a prison. Because 'Siegwart' is not difficult to be distinguished by its real merits from Miller's other novels manufactured for the occasion, we can in some measure excuse the youth and the ladies of Germany for their admiration of him. Miller had read the ancients with that noble zeal, which is always aiming after pure human improvement, and which is equally remote from all learned obscurity and from the mere spirit of an artisan,—a zeal which so advantageously distinguished the Göttingen union from the mere drudgery of students. He had made himself well acquainted with the old Swabian poets, and this distinguished him from all other novel-writers. Very few of those who wrote for the public were at this time masters of the pure and higher language of social intercourse, for Nicolai's tone and language were dull and vulgar; Wieland never wrote pure German, and both were tedious and diffuse. Miller, on the contrary, wrote his 'Siegwart' in good, flowing, easy German. It was first published in two small volumes, and as readers increased the work was extended. The scenes of the novel are painted in a pastoral style, and for this purpose he naturally availed himself of the localities of Swabia, as his Saxon friends in their poetical pastorals had availed themselves of the scenery of their native land. Miller speedily lost the reputation which he had gained by his 'Siegwart,' as soon as he absurdly enlarged his novel by a learned commentary, in the style of a philologist, and in the 'Correspondence of the three Academical Friends,' he became dull in style, expression, and language.

Miller himself has described to us the source from whence he and all his contemporaries derived their affected sentimentality, the billing and cooing, which is no passion, but mere foolery, the weeping and melancholy tone which prevail in their writings. These sources were the poems of Klopstock, who was exalted above, or at least placed on a level with, Homer! The poems are the production of that great tribe of wooers of the muse who wrote after the manner of Petrarch, whom Klopstock had collected around him, and whose tone corresponded with his own. This may be deduced from the following words in the first part of 'Siegwart.' The subject is the successful love of a

Swabian peasant-youth, and Miller pours out his feelings in the following strain:—"Happy the youth, whose soul is fettered by the chains of love alone! He and his beloved will wander under the trees of life, with Semida and Cidli, with Petrarch and Laura, with Klopstock and his Meta, and speak together of their earthly loves." From this and such passages we can immediately draw a general conclusion with respect to the prevailing tone of the book, and that of the people also, by whom it was so eagerly read. The single scenes which are portrayed, as well as the idolatry of Klopstock, which is pushed to the most exaggerated absurdity, are all borrowed from the living image of the age, as may be readily seen from the numerous letters belonging to the same period which have been published.

The prose of 'Siegwart' may be distinguished from that of Göthe's 'Werther,' as the style of Gessner's 'Pastorals' from that of Rousseau's 'Heloise'; for without being precisely poetical prose, it somewhat resembles verse without any fixed measure. All is sorrowful and melancholy; we hear only of churchyards, death, and mourning. Age is without maturity, youth has none of the characteristics of the spring-time of life; their feelings, in a manner altogether opposed to their nature, are directed, not towards enjoyment, but contemplation. It cannot however be denied, that all this worked in many parts of the country most beneficially, that the moral improvement of the people was promoted by this much-read novel, and that a taste for poetry and feelings of humanity were awakened and spread, instead of the reigning rudeness of mind and manners. Religion and morality are required and insisted upon in the whole of the book, and a lively feeling of the presence of God in the mind and in nature is substituted for the old dogmatics and the teaching of the catechism, which were merely exercises for the memory. Because we regard 'Siegwart' as a species of work for edification, and consider the first part of it as one of the most admirable of the many books which were at that time written for children and riper youth, we have allowed our notice of it to precede that of the new literature of education, to which we shall now turn our attention.

In all the books which were published for the purposes of instruction, or for the entertainment of children, and the information of parents, with which Germany was deluged after the time of Basedow, there will be found more or less of the

views of life and morality which were taught and inculcated in 'Siegwart;' the well-disposed character of the nation is everywhere apparent; but also their limited views of life, their small-town ideas; their pedantry and inclination to sermonize rather than to act. Weisse was one of the first writers on education for children, but we pass over his 'Child's Friend,' because he limited himself to the subject of that education which is connected with childhood, whereas Campe drew the whole of life and its concerns within his circle. Campe understood as well as Kotzebue how to take up his position, to place himself precisely in the condition of those who are called the public, *i.e.* of the so-called enlightened persons, of those who are trained and formed by novel-reading and superficial instruction. He was the prophet of that class of readers which was ridiculed and despised by Lichtenberg, Voss, Herder, Lessing, and Göthe, however different these writers were in their views in other respects, and who afterwards thronged in masses round Kotzebue.

Campe has indeed produced nothing of his own, nothing peculiar; but he brought into circulation amongst the masses things of the most various kinds, such as were suited to the taste and to the ideas of the burger classes, who were excluded from learned instruction. His 'Children's Library' has been indisputably among the most useful to our nation. After its contents had been considerably diminished by the exclusion of a great variety of subjects which had been at first introduced, only the very best specimens of the moral and cheerful new German literature were to be found combined in it, which were intelligible and interesting to children and to the people. By the use of this collection in instruction and in life, language and taste were purified and refined, and the young from their very youth, almost in the midst of the toys of their childhood, became acquainted with and attached to the most distinguished writers for the people, who had been only previously known in courses of learned instruction. Campe's morality for children was altogether a misapprehension, and belonged to the manner of modern training, by which the youthful mind is always directed, and directed exclusively, to what is of immediate utility. This misapprehension is to be excused, on the ground that people generally pass from one extreme to another, as in this case from the extreme of the middle ages to the extreme of the modern. This *morality* for children, which it was proposed to substitute

for the old dogmatic catechism, consisted of a false application of Schlosser's 'Catechism for Country-people,' to the instruction of children in general. Campe, and all the wise men of his and of our days, are at the same time right and wrong, when they wish to instruct the child and the people after the same fashion; they make it impossible for the immortal and free mind to live free in its ideas, and to be happy in its enjoyment, by harassing the young with exercises of memory, or with profitable objects in view, fixing attention perpetually upon what is material. They are wrong, because the classes of men, who in civilized states are called the people, must be thought of as stationary; that part of youth, however, which does not belong to these classes, must be thought of as something progressive, and therefore they should bring together much in the beginning of life, which they can only first learn to use when they approach its middle. Campe's 'Robinson the Younger,' by its title immediately calls to mind the 'History of Alexander Selkirk,' which Daniel Defoe, the celebrated English political and novel writer (1665-1731), took as the basis of his 'Robinson Crusoe.' Campe's work is very far inferior to its model. The idea never occurred to Campe of availing himself of Defoe's works for the promotion of that kind of education which Basedow and he, like Rousseau, wished to borrow from a condition of nature for the benefit of men who lived in the midst of convulsed and political relations. It was Rousseau, for example, who eulogized the 'History of Robinson the Elder,' as that book by means of which youth might be made most clearly to perceive what kinds of knowledge were alone useful and necessary, and how that knowledge was to be gained. Had Campe, in his educational revision of the old 'Robinson,' only omitted many excrescences, or matters of bad taste and gross improbabilities, in order to make the old history an entertaining reading-book for the family circle, by his easy style, well suited to enlightened conversation, and by pure and correct language, of which he was a master, he would have conferred great advantages upon those who educated and those who were receiving education, according to the new method, but he went further. What he added was silly, and promoted silliness. Campe's 'Robinson,' and with good reason, became a general reading-book for children, because there was no other book written in good German fit for the purpose, and it deluded children in the same decennium (1775-1785), as 'Siegwart'

captivated the more advanced youth by poetical religious dreams. It was the dry prose of the other side of that simple German pastoral life, which in 'Siegwart' was poetically delineated.

Campe's 'Robinson' no sooner came into the hands of the children of the educated classes, than Bible stories gradually disappeared: together with the practical prose of our humble relations in family life, there prevailed a theoretical also. A new generation sprung up, who thought only of what was obvious, domestic, immediate, and profitable in outward life, and which was full of childish pertness. Luther's translation of the Bible, understood or not understood, the fancy-stirring histories and poetry of the East, gave the mind at least a religious elevation, whereas the tedious moralizing of the new reading-book oppressed the soul, and drove boys who were indolent in learning into Rousseau's school, in which man does not find his proper element of being, by progress and in progress, but where, as the child of nature, he is born perfect. We cannot here speak of Campe's 'Discovery of America', nor of his other mutilated and diluted voyages and travels, which had no immediate influence upon life, and were not so widely circulated as the books which have been mentioned. We shall only mention in passing Salzmann's books for children, which were also in general circulation. Salzmann wisely confined himself strictly within the narrow domestic circle, and treats only of the ordinary relations and circumstances of common every-day life. His elementary work, which in our youth was the classical reading of the rising generation of more useful but more tedious men, describes the social circle of a prosperous German family, with all that kindness of feeling which lies in the German national character, but which at the same time attaches importance to trifles, as if the express object were to train up pedants and miserable pedlars in small wares. The reason why puerilities were treated in this and other similar books as matters of importance, is this: Klopstock's public and that of 'Siegwart' seized every opportunity, either to exhibit or to affect feelings, which passed for virtue, as in the preceding generation praying, singing, and church-going represented religion. In the same way the trifles of domestic life were magnified into importance by a book, as the whims and humours of the fashionable world by Jacobi's 'Woldemar.' On the other hand, German life gained much in clearness by this and other works similarly written. The young were led from mere blind

and impractical exercises of memory to lively and active perceptions, for the book was clearly, simply and heartfully written. The travels of Salzmann's pupils were less circulated, but they are to be ranked in the same class, and had the same object in view, as his elementary book.

The Swiss Pestalozzi, in his popular novel, written not so much for children as for the people, stands indisputably higher than either of the above-named German writers upon education. Pestalozzi's '*Lienhard and Gertrude, a book for the people,*' in reference to purity of style and grammatical correctness of language, is far inferior to the German works which have been mentioned; but it is, on the other hand, incomparable in consequence of the pure religiousness of character which pervades it, and the delineation of all the striking incidents of a life sustained by natural and noble feelings under the most depressing circumstances. The work would have had more value, if the author had left it in its original form, consisting of only 370 pages, as it was first published by Decker in Berlin. In this first edition, some very skilful hand assisted the author in reference to expression and language; at a later period some one lent his aid, who altered the whole nature and proper character of this immortal work for the worse. It was the offspring of no poetical fancy, but sprung from the pure sources of a heart, full of inward sympathy with the lot of the poorest classes of the people, and yearning to do them good. The book was, in its continuation, made a treasury of all sorts of the most various doctrines and information, by which it was wholly robbed of its main advantages, quick action, a short and pithy morality; and the story, which had been completely brought to a close in the first part, was spun out into great diffuseness. The first edition consisted merely of what became afterwards the first part. It contains the simple history of a poor Bernese peasant family, at a time in which the aristocracy of Berne were lords of the soil, in the German sense of the word, and at the same time the protectors and benefactors of their peasants. The history is treated in such a way, that the whole village and all the affairs of the parish are introduced,—mayor, innkeeper, parson, lord of the manor, and all the different parish officers are presented to us in speech and action. By the author's mode of treatment and talents, by his intimate acquaintance with the situation, modes of thinking, and affairs of the country-people, that vulgarity of

mind which springs from mere love of gain and gross sensual rudeness are placed in striking contrast with that finer moral feeling born with the poorest, or gained by him from religious thought and instruction. This contrast pervades the whole book, in all the actions and characters of the very numerous and various persons who are introduced. As all the inhabitants of the village are brought upon the stage, an opportunity is thereby given of depicting to the eye the different gradations and shades of the rude characters of the various members of the parish who are bent only on the acquisition of outward advantages, and of the sound and religious feelings and modes of thinking among others, and at the same time of making the people see clearly the consequences of both. The book, it is true, is pervaded by the sentimentality of the decennium in which it was written, and we have therefore classed it with other sentimental works of entertainment. Nothing is idealized; the chief character alone is somewhat too strongly drawn. This must have happened in consequence of its aim; the other persons are all likenesses, taken from a circle which Pestalozzi had long and carefully observed, and the clergyman, as well as the squire, are the real productions of Bernese life, as it then was. The Bernese, like the Genevese clergyman, had quite a different character to play in society from that of the common German village parson; and the Bernese aristocracy, however proud they were in other respects, were bound by policy to be kind and condescending to the peasantry; and we by no means deny, that they were so also from feelings of real humanity, because they were honoured in the country with almost sacred respect. Pestalozzi only used foreign aid for correctness or ornament of expression and language. He had the cordial tone of the people fully in his own power, and was able to employ the tragical and touching side of life, as well as the burlesque, for the promotion of his object. It would in no respect have injured his design if he had omitted a great number of those oaths and execrations which occur in the course of the book.

In connexion with these sentimental novels and writings upon education, which were partly the fruit of the age, and partly that of speculation, grounded upon the changed views and condition of life, we must very briefly notice the novel manufacturers who availed themselves of the new taste, in order to gain reputation or money. From that time forward they became the

pest of the land, weakened the minds of the people, and threw insurmountable obstacles in the way of the first steps and onward progress of a spirit of improvement which began to pervade all ranks of the people, by selling sentimental stories, or wild bounds from one subject to another, as works of genius or as poetry. These manufacturers prepared books according to order and demand, such as women and blockheads would have them, instead of compelling these, if they wished to read, to raise themselves to the level of their books. Thus fathers and mothers were miseducated by novel-writers, as the disciples and honourers of Rousseau and Basedow miseducated the children. We touch very slightly upon this class of forgotten writers, and do not mention the geniuses of power, the humourists and romantic school at all, because we can refer to the history of our poetic literature, which has been lately admirably treated. It would be very easy for us, moreover, from our own experience and from the long and careful observation of a life devoted to the observation of the influence of literature upon domestic and social relations, from decennium to decennium, to present the reader with copious details. At the present moment the influence appears to be very small.

Miller of Ulm, and John Gottwerth Miller of Itzehoe, unquestionably deserve the first place among those whom we venture to call book-manufacturers. We have already mentioned the novels of the former, but we ought to have added his ‘Carl Ferdiner’ to the list of his tedious books of entertainment which we then mentioned, and which were prepared as regularly manufactured articles after the publication of ‘Siegwart.’ The latter had at least the merit of bringing back his north German readers of both sexes from sighs and tears to smiles and laughter. In his ‘Siegfried von Lindenberg,’ J. G. Miller showed a species of comic talent, which was altogether suited to the tone of the countries from which he selected his first heroes; but he showed at the same time also some knowledge of mankind, although it was limited to those phases of humanity which Pomerania, Holstein and Mecklenburg present. The only thing, in reference to German improvement, to the tone and taste of the time, which deserves to be remarked about ‘Siegfried von Lindenberg,’ and which is the result of our own immediate experience, is, that it is astonishing how a book so full of bad wit, often expressed in vulgar language and composed in a dull tone, could possibly

have excited the attention which it really did. The first part of the story of Herr von Waldheim, which also marked an epoch, contains wit of a still smaller calibre; from that time Miller sunk down to the condition of a tedious and wearisome polygraph.

We cannot pass over Bretzner, Iffland, Jünger, and Grossmann in silence, because they prepared pieces and had them published, in which the tone of the education of their time, the kind of morality taught by Campe and Salzmann, the tender-hearted virtue without strength, and the false feeling of tedious novels was brought into action, and by means of the eye and the ear impressed upon the soul. These manufacturers of what have been called affecting plays, knew their public, and the manner in which it had been formed; they knew the means of exciting their feelings, as well as the tactics of the stage. They were perfect masters of that species of wit with which ordinary society is entertained, or by which the coffee-room is cheered with mirth. They therefore accomplished little, which their imitators and followers could not easily reach. Iffland's 'Guardian' (1784), and his 'Sportsman' (1785), excited great attention, but they only served to open the way for a master in this species of writing,—a man whose name was in the mouth of every friend of the theatre in Europe and out of Europe, during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, and for the first fifteen years of the nineteenth,—we mean Von Kotzebue. Whatever may be thought of him as a man and a writer, he is more important as an historical phenomenon, than hundreds of noble men and truly great minds, who have been only admired in secret by the few who have understood them.

Kotzebue's influence, the most part of his writings, his effect upon the public mind as a dramatist, all lie beyond the limits which in point of time we have prescribed to ourselves in this history; we can therefore only refer to the commencement of his writing, which fell within this period. He began in 1785 as a sentimental novel-writer, and gained notice and favour by the same talents and qualities which made him afterwards the favourite writer of novel-readers and play-goers, in spite of his violations of the rules of taste, and in spite of the unsparing criticism which was directed against him. The 'Sorrows of the Ortenberg Family,' was the novel with which he began his career; and in this his first effort he displays the same powers of inventing scenes, intrigues and affecting incidents, the same not

very edifying morality, the same carelessness in language and thought, which made the dramas and stories of all kinds, which were prepared by him in the following thirty years objects of admiration to the great majority of the public, of contempt, scorn and bitter ridicule to the minority. The opinion of this minority was not indeed listened to at the time, but in the end it has received its right.

Salzmann joined the manufacturers, and wrote his ‘Carl von Carlsberg, or Human Misery.’ This dull fabrication bespeaks its tendency in its title; and because so much was then deficient in Germany which time has improved, it might be thought that the work might be useful as an evidence of the social condition of the times; but it has not even that value. So many miserable nothings or accidental and local deficiencies are related, in its six long tedious parts, as signs of human misery, that one would be ashamed to make any really serious use of them.

§ IV.

LESSING AND HERDER.—INTELLIGIBLE AND POETIC CHRISTIANITY.—LAVATER AND LICHTENBERG.—FANATICISM AND SATIRE.

In the preceding paragraphs we have given an account of the gradual and progressive occupancy of the chairs in the German universities by men of free-thinking minds, as teachers of the state religion, of the complete change of education in the higher and middle classes, and of the origin of a system of education for common life quite different from that of the learned; we now pass on to speak of those controversies which were the results of these changes, and of the great national works which were either caused by them, or written during their existence. A complete change of literature must have necessarily been connected, among the German protestants, with a change in the wooden dogmatics of the seventeenth century, because the latter was connected with a better explanation of the poetry and history of the east, as it is contained in the sources of the Christian history. To this it may be added, that the whole literature of the preceding time was no longer suited to a generation which had been instructed from books that were imitations of or derived from the ancients, or from the French classics of the eighteenth century. Life and

motion were to an extraordinary extent increased in our whole youthful literature, by the struggle of the literary men of the age, fighting their way and conquering by the powers of reason and their own vigorous application of it, against blind faith and its defenders, who had at that time the whole police of the German governments under their control and marshalled on their behalf; and, as always happens, new fire was struck from both sides by their violent collisions.

With a view to obtain a clearer idea of these controversies, the reformers of the protestant system of faith and the literature connected with it, may be conveniently divided into three parties. The one wished to reduce all religion to dry morality, without any excitement of the fancy or mental sensibility; the second laboured to prove that Christianity was pure Deism, or a religion of reason, and gave quite a different meaning to the words of Christ from that of the dogmatists of the middle ages, who sometimes applied their scholasticism to the Scriptures, or sometimes derived it from them. The third party, by a critical and philosophical view of the system of faith, wished to deduce something from it, which they called primitive Christianity, however problematical it may be whether any such was ever taught. Semler took the last of these paths; Griesbach, Eichhorn, Paulus, Plank, and Spittler followed Semler's footsteps, although they occasionally deviated in various respects from his track, and sometimes even went in an opposite direction. Eberhardt, from the time of his settlement in Halle, contended for pure Deism, and his 'Apology of Socrates,' in which his views of Christianity and his principles are fully declared, was in the hands of all men of education. Campe, Salzmann, Nicolai, and all the reformers of education were anxious to substitute a system of dry, dull, and tedious moralizing for the old dogmatics. How unsatisfactory this appeared to the new generation, how little further the old method of impressing things upon the memory without thinking upon their nature or meaning, or applying them to life and action, could reach, may be seen from the fact, that even the godless Bahrdt found a numerous public for his prose, which profaned the poetry of the New Testament, and for his moral sermons, to which his course of life and conversation was a living contradiction. We have already mentioned Bahrdt's New Testament; his work upon morals also was not only regarded by the middle classes in general as a good book, but was even con-

sidered by those to whom the author was an object of loathing and contempt as an unexceptionable work.

There was one man among the reformers of German literature, and next to Göthe unquestionably the greatest among them, who, although he did not, like Göthe, properly speaking, write for the great public, yet was eager to devote himself also to the religious improvement of the people. This man could be no other than Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. We have already mentioned his works which had this tendency in the preceding part of this history. Lessing offered a vigorous and determined opposition to all these three methods of interpretation and enlightenment. It is singular enough, and characteristic of the blindness of zealots in all ages, that a much more hostile feeling was excited against him than against the boldest of the innovators. He regarded it as absurd for the chiefs of the three schools of Rationalism, as their system is now called, to attempt to substitute a new religion, artistically worked out of Christianity, for Christianity itself, as the stupid dogmatic memoriter men would admit of no progress, no light, no accommodation of their system to the necessities of the age, such as even the old Church itself had admitted till the time of the Council of Trent. He wished to assume a middle position, and met with that fate which generally befalls those who interfere to put an end to strife. In his 'Berengarius of Tours' he had already shown that he possessed the rare art of treating theological subjects in such a manner as to constrain every one to take an interest in the subject, as if it was a question of general literature.

Lessing had studied the writings of Spinoza and Leibnitz too carefully not to have a great respect for the scholastics and for the consequent nature of that dogmatical system which was deduced by them. He saw clearly how the doctrine of the Trinity and other similar doctrines could be philosophically used, and how untenable all that was which the innovators wished to substitute for this consequent system. Lessing, therefore, at first undertook the defence of the old philosophical dogmatics in opposition to the deistical superficiality, but at a later period he made even the blind zealots see, by some strong hints, how easy it would be to humble their insolent assumption. He did both, in the character of a mere interpreter of others, in which he exhibited the appearance of merely fulfilling the duty of a librarian. It appeared as if he wished to communicate to the whole nation

the treasury of manuscripts which had been entrusted to him; but he only profited by the occasion to check the superficial forwardness of the deists, to enliven a dry philosophical subject by the mode of its treatment, and to bring to light the vigour and majesty of our language, which he helped to regenerate, and to show his surpassing art in its accomplishment.

Lessing maintained the cause of the orthodox, by printing in two pages the plan of a preface which he had accidentally found among the manuscripts of the Wolfenbüttele library. This preface was written by Leibnitz, and had been intended by him to be prefixed to a treatise upon the eternity of future punishments, and with a view to defend that doctrine. He availed himself of this opportunity, in his 'Contributions to Literature from the Wolfenbüttele Library,' to express his opinion about the noise which was made by the innovators of the day. To the few sheets which had been written by Leibnitz, Lessing added a short treatise, not written in the tedious method of popular philosophy, in which he proved satisfactorily, that the dogmatic system of the scholastics, with respect to the consequences of sin, was more consequent and philosophical than the then universally praised theory, which Eberhardt had enunciated in his 'Apology of Socrates.' In the same 'Contributions' he printed another treatise, in favour of the scholastics, to which an essay of a few sheets, written by Leibnitz, upon the doctrine of the Trinity, served him as a text. Without its being exactly so declared, this treatise was directed against another class of innovators,—against Semler and the disciples of the Berlin school, but especially against the then ruling school of Wolf. All these, and among them the man who was at that time regarded as the model of a philosophical theologian and elegant German writer, the Abbot Jerusalem in Brunswick, were desirous of constructing a religion of reason out of the old faith, of giving up something in the wonderfully consequent system, which is intimately bound together in all its parts, in order afterwards to be able to demonstrate the remainder in a mathematical manner, according to the principles of Wolf. Both his treatises were directed against such a course as that pursued by those who had already, after the manner of Wolf and Baumgarten, theologically coined the able and highly endowed Leibnitz into thick quartos for the advantage of their school and their system.

In these two short papers Lessing showed, in a clear and po-

pular manner, that Leibnitz had treated the subject much more rationally and soundly than all the new rationalist theologians, who, at the same time, called themselves Christian divines. Leibnitz, whether he believed in all the dogmas or not,—for that is here no part of the question, being wholly a personal matter,—sought only to prove the possibility and consequent nature of the old system; but it never occurred to his sound mind to aim at kindling true faith in the soul by means of demonstration, because, according to the system which he defended, true faith can only be the result of the operation of the divine spirit upon the heart of man, and to that spirit Leibnitz referred it. Lessing establishes this view in his own clear and clever manner, in the second paper, § XI., where he thus expresses himself:—"Enough," says he, "Leibnitz continued to think upon this subject, as he had been instructed in his youth; namely, that there are two sorts of reasons for the truth of our religion, human and divine, as it is expressed in the compends; that is, as he has expressed it, in opposition to a Frenchman, who, without doubt, had not read much of our compends, explicable and inexplicable, of which the former must remain a subject of conviction, which conviction, or its complement, is produced only and alone by means of the other—the inexplicable."

This distinction is accompanied by Lessing with an irony, as fine as it is severe, against the uncalled-for and shallow theological dabblers in reason, and interpreters of the secret things of God, who were extremely numerous in his time. "This old-fashioned opinion of his," he continues, "must be forgiven Leibnitz; for how could he foresee, that very soon after his time, as it now appears, a class of men should arise, who, without delaying upon this question of controversy, should put their hand to the work, and give a validity and strength, of which he had no idea, to all those reasons which had been hitherto regarded as explicable but insufficient?" Lessing was in general as little favourable as Göthe and Jacobi (the latter upon quite different grounds from those of the two former,) to the creators of the so-called moral religion, which was altogether prosaic. Lessing felt much more unfavourably disposed to the dull Moralists, or, as they are now scoffingly called, Rationalists, who wished to rob the religion of the people and the state, (for of that alone we speak,) of all poetry, symbols, anthropomorphism, than to the zealots for the old faith, whom he only pitied. The latter had

themselves wholly to blame for his attacks upon them, because they presumed to treat a great and thinking man as if he had been one of their own godchildren. Göze, Ziegra, and others contributed learned intelligence and notices to the *Hamburg Journal*, which, on account of the quality of the paper and the nature of the contents, was usually called 'The Black Journal:' these men wrote against Lessing in such a tone, that it became altogether intolerable; and for that reason alone he took the field against these Lutheran inquisitors, in connexion with his friend, the noble and learned Reimarus, the author of the 'Wolfenbüttle Fragments.'

It has only been generally known in the present century, that Reimarus was the author of the 'Wolfenbüttle Fragments,' which he himself never acknowledged. It appears, however, from some letters which have been lately printed, that Hamann must either have known or suspected it, for he wrote to Herder as early as November 1778, that Reimarus was the author. Reimarus was obliged to content himself in Hamburg with fanatical Lutheranism, to endure a memoriter religion, and the overbearing and domineering character of the clergy; and this led him to feel such a repugnance against this form of Christianity, that he entertained a feeling of dislike to Christianity itself; and the consequence was, that without calling upon himself public attention, he wrote a learned work against revelation. Reimarus was a physician and natural philosopher, possessed a profound and learned knowledge of the ancients, of the original languages of the Old and New Testament, and, without pushing himself prominently forward, he proved a powerful enemy of the irrational zealots and their wooden dogmatics: he was, however, universally acknowledged to be an honourable, admirable Christian, who would have no connexion or intercourse, public or private, with such men as Bahrdt and his friends, and therefore anonymously and in writing stated his difficulties and objections with regard to the historical and documentary proofs of Christianity. As Reimarus was thoroughly acquainted with everything which had been written both for and against Christianity, he laboured quietly and privately at his writings, which raised a feeling of extreme danger and almost despair in the minds of theologians, as Lessing from time to time gave some of his writings to the public, because there were no weapons fit to repel the assault to be found in the whole immense arsenal of apologetic writers,

and new ones must be forged for the occasion. In this paper, whose author in the preceding century remained as completely unknown as the author of Junius' Letters still remains, the truth and purity of Christian morality were assailed with as much solidity and learning, and from the very same sources, and with the same acuteness, with which it has been defended by its innumerable apologists, from the time of Origen till the present day.

A transcript of the paper lay in the Wolfenbüttle library, from which copies were secretly taken and put in circulation, corrupted, as is usually the case, by all sorts of interpolations: it occurred therefore to Lessing, to have portions of it sent to the press in his 'Contributions to Literature from the Wolfenbüttle Library.' His object was, to awaken in theology also that movement which was now pervading the whole German literature, and to aid the intellectual progress of the nation, which he roused and mightily promoted in almost all branches of science, of the arts, and poetry. He therefore suddenly disturbed, and that in a most disagreeable manner, the theologians who were softly reposing upon their apologetic laurels, and who were in the highest degree offended, although he assured them, when he published the first fragment, that his object was to promote science, inquiry and truth by its publication, and that he himself was besides far from agreeing in opinion with the author of the fragment. The manuscript from which he took the copy was by no means intended for the people, whom its contents could only injure, and Lessing therefore also caused the first fragment to be printed in papers and journals which were only accessible to some few classes of the learned; Göze, however, and other poor zealots brought the cause before the public, and thereby necessarily obliged Lessing to adopt the cause as his own, as that of the people and its literature, and to crush the zealots to pieces. A struggle between light and darkness arose in this controversy between Göze and Lessing, similar to that which took place at the time of the Reformation in Luther's controversy with Eck and Emser.

The blind zealots no sooner attacked him, and made him responsible for the work of another party, than Lessing indeed defended the cause of freedom of thought and inquiry with bitterness and vehemence. Precisely in the same manner as Luther did with his opponents, Lessing, when he had once begun the controversy with the orthodox, sent forth numerous, able,

and crushing pamphlets, which were written altogether in the manner of Luther, and with all the strength of his style and of his language. These writings must necessarily have a place in the history of the eighteenth century, because, as we hope, they will continue to be read by our nation, as long as the vigorous German language and a noble and vigorous German spirit shall be esteemed; and who should not hope that this will be for ever? The first fragment (1774) only touched upon the question of toleration; those which followed referred to the condemnation of reason from the pulpit, and to the impossibility of having a revelation which should be believed by all men, in a satisfactory manner. In this last fragment, Lessing's anonymous authority, for whose boldness he was held responsible, was very severe upon the Apostles, and especially upon St. Paul; but every man must have seen that Lessing, who attached great value to Spinoza, could not coincide with Reimarus precisely on these particular topics. In the 'Contributions' there afterwards appeared a fragment against the miraculous passage of the Israelites over the Red Sea, and somewhat later, the proof or presumed proof that the Old Testament was not written in order to reveal a system of religion.

Lessing was assailed on all sides in consequence of the publication of these pieces, although they did not, properly speaking, affect the Christian religion. In the fourth Contribution however (1777) a fragment appeared, in which Christianity was directly attacked, and that with unsparing severity. This caused a universal clamour and confusion, because the zealots durst not venture to reply to powerful and solid attacks by abuse alone. The attack which was made in this fragment upon the 'History of the Resurrection of Christ,' and upon the Gospel history in general, was bitter and unjust; this however was less provoking to the poor theologians, who were accustomed from year to year, in books, in their pulpits and chairs, to harp upon the same string, than the fact, that their wisdom and learning were quite insufficient to enable them to enter the field against Reimarus; and hence they were reduced to a state of sheer despair. This fragment is unquestionably by far the most important of anything which had been brought forward against the histories of the New Testament up to that time; for the author does not fight with the blunt weapons of the English and French deists, nor with the mere satire and scoffing of the Parisian

academicians and encyclopædists, but he appears in the full armour of learned German exegesis, and prepared by the training of solid German learning. All this the poor theologians of Germany sensibly felt, from the venerable but unspeakably dull Semler, and from the elegant Abbot Jerusalem, to Melchior Göze, the watchman of Zion, and his fellow-controversialist Behn, co-rector in Lübeck.

The history of the interminable and vehement paper war which was carried on with respect to this fragment, does not belong to this history of the regeneration of Germany; it must be left to those who write the history of the Church; we shall however mention such particulars as may be necessary to point out the nature of those papers which Lessing wrote in connexion with the subject. Lessing's fugitive pieces show him to have been a most eloquent writer in the best species of eloquence,—in that in which controversy is carried on, not with declamation and pomposity of words, but with conquering reasoning and condensed argument. These controversial writings of Lessing's are unquestionably the most perfect of the kind which our language contains: they gave the death-blow to the old dogmatics, and yet Lessing, like his then unknown friend, did not wound that respect which every educated and thinking man will have and must have for the Christian religion and for its history. With respect to this point, we must not omit to state, that Lessing had previously accompanied every one of the fragments published by him with remarks, in which he stated, that he by no means agreed in opinion with the writer, and in which he also brought forward all the best existing materials which might serve for the confutation of the fragmentist. All this however was no avail, and Lessing was at last provoked to serious enmity.

Attacked from all sides, defamed and persecuted by the adherents of orthodoxy and by the police, which was urged on and encouraged by them, Lessing at last published a fragment which Reimarus, if he wrote the piece, (which appears to us very doubtful) only wrote to provoke the stupified zealots and to reduce them to despair by an exaggerated pleasantry. According to his views of a state religion, Lessing could as little have really agreed in sentiment with this piece as pastor Göze himself. This fragment made a complete book in itself, with the title, 'Concerning the Object of Jesus and his Apostles, another

fragment of the *Wolfenbüttle Unknown*.' (1778, 276 pp. 8vo.) It is much easier radically to refute this fragment than that against the history of the Resurrection, because it brings forward accusations, whereas the other only disputes facts. Who, except an anonymous writer, would venture to accuse of imposture and deceit the founder of the purest of all religions, of the preacher of the doctrine of universal charity, which among all religions claiming to be revelations from God has become the most useful to morality, the prophet who was free and pure from every earthly passion and desire, and who poor himself collected his first disciples from the same class and preached to the poor, the sinful, and the broken-hearted? It will be clearly seen from what follows, that Lessing first provoked and enraged the theologians by the publication of this piece, after they had calumniated and persecuted him in the most scandalous manner. The raving and blind adherents of the old system would hear of no philosophy, would take no counsel, would give up no sentence; they said of their wooden dogmatics, as the general of the Jesuits said of his order, *Sit ut est, aut non sit*; they experienced what, sooner or later, all ultras must experience, and what we suffer from in our own times in consequence of the misconduct of the zealots.

With respect to this controversy, which the whole united body of polemical theologians in Germany carried on with great bitterness against Lessing, we only refer to Lessing's writings as masterpieces of style and language. We have only to do with the question in its bearing on the spirit of the age, on the condition of the education and mental culture of the eighth decennium, and on the progress of all branches of literature. In this controversy we may therefore pass over all the writings of the great as well as the small theologians which do not stand in immediate connexion with the masterly papers and dissertations of Lessing. Director Schumann in Hanover was among the first who took the field against Lessing. This writer, in opposition to the last fragment, appealed to a proof which might have been very good in the time of Origen, but which he very simply borrowed from Origen and applied to our times. In this short reply to the gleanings of Schumann, Lessing calls this proof the proof of spirit and power. In his answer ('On the Proof of Spirit and Power,' 1777), Lessing justly treats this proof borrowed from Origen with great contempt. Among other things he

remarks that, if it be admitted that accounts of prophecies fulfilled and miracles performed, to which Origen and Schumann appeal, be as authentic and genuine as it is possible for historical truths to be, still accidental historical truth can never be a proof of the necessary truths of reason. Schumann did not fail to make a reply to Lessing's paper, and this furnished the latter with an occasion for the composition of an admirable dialogue upon Christianity, which, as being intended to exemplify the pure doctrine of eternal love, he entitled 'The Testament of John.' In this he introduces Schumann and himself as speakers, and relates, that John when dying declared to his disciples that the joyful message which Christ brought to the children of men (the Gospel), consists in the announcement of the mystery of love; or, as Lessing afterwards explains himself, that it is infinitely more difficult to practise love towards enemies and friends for a whole life through, than to learn dogmatics in order to believe what has been learned. In order to show the manner in which the zealots used the words and sayings of the Scriptures, in opposition to this theory of love, Lessing puts those well-known words, in conclusion, into the mouth of his opponent,—“He that is not for me is against me;” to which he bitterly replies, “Yes, certainly, that puts me to silence:—O! you alone are a true Christian, and as well read in the Scriptures as the devil.”

It is obvious, in the midst of all this strife with the theologians, that Lessing's object was by no means to make a revolution in religion, but that he wished to restore Christianity to its proper place in the respect of thinking men, which it had then greatly lost, and to defend it, not only against hypocrites and zealots by whom it was corrupted and deformed, but also against refining and speculative rationalists and insolent scoffers. He now therefore wrote, in reference to the history of the New Testament, the second part of his 'Treatise upon the Education of Mankind,' as he had published the first part in his 'Contributions' in reference to the attack of the Unknown upon the history of the Old Testament. In the first part he had proved that the Old Testament does not contain the last revelation of God, but was only preliminary, that it was the primary school, in which the education of mankind was begun. The Old Testament therefore, according to his opinion, contains those doctrines and narratives which were suited to the different circumstances of

mankind till the time of Christ. In the second part of his 'Education of Mankind,' this is applied to the times after Christ. In this portion of his writing he explains in what way God vouchsafed to cause his light again to shine among men in all its ancient glory, through Christ, when the glory of his doctrines which, in figures and images, had been announced to the people of Israel, had been almost extinguished and made human by the vain wisdom of the dogmatical and ceremonial Jews.

Because it appears to us important for our age to call Lessing's admirable principles to recollection, and to show clearly what he considered to be the relation of Judaism to Christianity, and of both to mankind, we shall here introduce a passage from the second part of his treatise upon the 'Education of the Human Race:'—"Every elementary book," he observes, "is only destined for a certain age. It is injurious to the child who has grown beyond it, to use it longer than it is suited to his opinions. That gives him a narrow, perverted, and crafty understanding; that makes him superstitious, mysterious, and full of contempt for everything which is comprehensible and easy. Such were the wise men who as rabbis treated their books! such was the character which they thereby imparted to the people! a better teacher was required to snatch away the exhausted elementary book from the hands of the child—Christ came." This text is enlarged upon and discussed by Lessing in his own masterly way, in language which a German cannot read often enough ("*manu diurna nocturnaque versare*"), if he would learn the excellence and power of his mother-tongue; but the zealous had no perception of any such excellences; they continued to rave and to storm. The mad and fiery zeal of these men, who were learned in the system of their catechisms acquired by memory, by word of mouth, and from writing, awakened in Lessing's mind a great antipathy to their unreasonableness and their misunderstanding of his explanations, and called forth that fearful pamphlet, which, like a flash of lightning, set the ancient Zion completely in flames, and which was ill guarded by its watchmen with abuse, calumny, and curses as their weapons.

His first invective was directed against Ness, the Wolfenbüttele superintendent, whom Lessing satirically calls his neighbour. In the very title of his replication to Ness's reply to the attack of the Unknown upon the history of the Resurrection, he had showed his contempt for his arguments. Instead of entitling

his paper a reply, he called it a Duplicate, as if he and the Apostles were on the side of the assailed. The vehemence of this attack of Lessing's upon an old and simple-minded man might perhaps surprise and offend the quiet reader, if a passage which we shall quote did not show clearly, that Lessing felt what thousands of Germans have felt, but what none has expressed in so lively a manner as he has done: first, that because the German constitutions render the free expression of opinion on political events impossible, every German must the more firmly and strenuously maintain freedom of thinking and writing upon theological and scientific subjects, and regard every opponent of this freedom as an enemy of mankind; secondly, Lessing felt, what every thinking man feels in common with him, that the real being and life of man does not consist, as the old superintendant thinks it does, in the knowledge or the belief of the thing learned, but in striving and wrestling after knowledge,—not in the having and retaining of wisdom, but in the search after it. Lessing expresses this admirably when he says,—“If God should hold in his right hand all truth, and in his left the ever-active impulse and love of search after truth, although accompanied with the condition that I should ever err, and should say, Choose! I would choose the left with humility, and say: Give, Father! pure truth belongs to thee alone!” His chief struggle however was with Göze in Hamburg, and Lessing's pamphlets written against him deserve the first place among the masterpieces of their kind. Among such masterpieces we reckon Luther's vehement controversial writings (these are sometimes too full of his peculiar rudeness, vulgarity, and occasional indecency); to these we add Demosthenes' Philippics, Cicero's speeches against Catiline, and especially, because they are more nearly related to Lessing's manner, Junius's Letters, and Rousseau's letter to the archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont.

Göze has also obtained an undeserved but unenviable immortality by means of Lessing's pamphlet. In his disreputable *Black Journal*, or ‘Hamburg Voluntary Contributions to News from the Empire of Learning’ (Nos. 58 to 63 of the year 1778), he had not only attacked the fragmentist, but Lessing also, on account of the manner in which he had sought to refute the fragment, and abused and reviled him like a grand inquisitor. The tone which he assumed will be best understood from his

own words: "He has read," he observes, "Lessing's objections and correctives, which are added to the fragment and placed in opposition to its principles, with much greater sorrow than the fragments of so coarse and so openly sinful an author, which are conceived in a spirit the most hostile to our most holy faith." Not satisfied with circulating these attacks by means of his newspapers in all the beer-houses and villages, Göze collected these pieces, and, like a Lutheran pope or bishop, he put them in circulation in the form of a pastoral circular, among all the stiff and rigidly orthodox of the time, who were so numerous that they might be called the public, and prefixed to them this ridiculous title: 'Something preliminary against the mediate and immediate Attacks of Herr Court-councillor Lessing, made upon our most holy Religion, and upon its only foundation, the Holy Scriptures,' by John Melchior Göze, 1778. Lessing was now necessarily obliged to take up the glove which had been thrown down. This he did in a parable and a declaration of defiance, which are as cutting as they are short.

Lessing's parable against Göze is lively, witty and striking, but quiet and moderate. The defiance is written as in a storm, with fearful vehemence and an overwhelming stream of eloquence, but without the use of a single term of abuse or reviling. It will be sufficiently seen from Lessing's own words, quoted in the note, how fearfully he shatters the grand inquisitor with the vehemence and torrent of his eloquence*. Lessing's friends hoped that Göze would remain silent after this first exchange of paper shots, but that was impossible for him, and even his miserable esquires aspired to the honours of knighthood by breaking a lance with Lessing. The religion of the people suffered the more in this controversy, as Lessing always remained victorious over its defenders, and had always those who were disposed to ridicule it in his favour.

Again and again provoked by Göze, Lessing eleven times in succession wrote short pastoral letters, with sound reason, philosophy and good taste, in opposition to the pastorals of the

* "Not that I wish to reproach you with every malicious allusion, every poisonous bite (if God will), every comical outbreak of your tragical compassion, every gnashing sigh, which sighs at being nothing but a sigh; every pastoral excitement which is a matter of pious duty to the temporal powers, with which they will from this time forward lard and season their conduct towards me, nor would I hinder them if I could. I am not so unreasonable as to look for anything from a bird more than its feathers. This kind of medium has long since lost its credit."

foolish watcher of Zion, who demanded from a thinking man the implicit adoption of his own faith and that of his blind religious associates. Each of these manifestos of Lessing, which was very short, bore the title 'Anti-Göze,' and they were only distinguished from one another by a number; each by its vehemence of language and power of argument annihilated the pastor, who was true to his symbolical faith, and put down the fanatical clamour about the infidelity of the great founder of modern German literature and the creator of a new language. In these manifestos, the catechism faith and the doctrines of the thundering zealots, who were rich in phrases and full of unction, but very poor in reasons to satisfy a philosophical mind, were shattered and destroyed in a very different way from that in which the men who were really unbelievers, and who were not German in their feelings, would have wished to see it put down. The substance of these manifestos was afterwards understood in a very different manner from that in which Lessing intended them to be, by a new generation, who knew what it meant to stand under the power of the priests (which our generation does not seem to know), and who were striving after civil and religious freedom. Lessing understood how to value Christianity as a philosopher. How great Lessing was as an eloquent writer, in what a masterly manner he understood how to use language and style, and how immeasurably the nation was perfected by the controversy, as it had formerly been by that of Hutten and Luther with the Papists, may be best perceived from the passage quoted below, selected from his 'Anti-Göze,' No. 5*.

The number of writings which appeared in connexion with the 'Fragmentist' increased, as usually happens in Germany, to an incredible extent, so that whole pages might be filled with the mere titles alone; the cause of an unchangeable faith how-

* "O, happy times! when the clergy were all in all,—thought for us and ate for us! How willingly would the chief pastor have brought you back again in triumph! How eagerly does he desire that all the rulers of Germany would unite with him in his salutary views! He preaches sweet and sour, sets Heaven and Hell before them! If they will not hear, they may feel! Wit and the language of the country are the dunghills in which the weeds of rebellion sprout up so readily and so quick. To-day a poet, tomorrow a regicide; Clement, Ravaillac, were not formed in the confessionals, but upon Parnassus. I shall return however to commonplaces of the chief pastor upon another occasion; at present, if it is not clear enough already, I shall only make it perfectly clear, that Mr. Pastor Göze does not grant what he appears to grant, and that these are only the claws, which it provokes the tiger so much only to be able to strike into the wooden railing!"

ever lost far more by its defenders than by the attacks of the 'Fragmentist,' for the most of their writings were bad, and all of them were tedious. In his 'Nathan,' the masterpiece of his dramatic poetry, Lessing's views of religion were so ably and attractively placed in opposition to the old and intolerable doctrine of a verbal and symbolical unity of faith, that they speedily drove this dark theory of the seventeenth century, and which was wholly unsuitable to the civilization of the eighteenth, altogether out of German life. Moreover, as to Lessing's own views of religion, and in reference to the course of Providence in the history of German mental improvement at the time of the first bloom of our literature, the fact must not be overlooked how wonderfully it came to pass, that immediately from the very commencement, Herder's superabundance was seen along with Lessing's intelligibility—always appeared silently struggling with it, and following Lessing step for step.

Lessing was ruled by reason exclusively: he himself therefore admits, that the lofty speech of creative poetic vigour for the execution of great works of poetry, the higher tragedy, the epos, or the higher lyric compositions, had not been bestowed upon him by nature. We add, however, that he possessed, on the contrary, the rare gift of being able to tell where that high poetic spirit did exist, and where it did not, and why it was not where the multitude believed themselves to have found it. At the same time Lessing himself knew within what limits his mind was creative, and within these he created his masterpieces. The same was the case also with respect to the Jewish and Christian religions, which Herder conceived quite differently from Lessing: the latter however also knew well how to estimate their value as the way to knowledge, as the positive law of a certain kind of the inward life in its struggle with the outward. In the second part of his 'Education of the Human Race,' he had previously shown how the revealed truths of the Christian religion, which are with difficulty comprehended by reason, such as the Trinity, original sin, election, and others, may be regarded as means by which certain rational truths which lie in them may be perceived: in 'Nathan' he goes a step further.

Since Lessing's 'Nathan' occupies the next place in our dramatic literature to the masterpieces of Göthe and Schiller, and because it is Lessing's most distinguished poetical work, it had also the most palpable influence upon the whole of Ger-

many; it cannot therefore be passed over, like other poetical productions, in this history of German life and of German mental improvement, or be named without pointing out the nature and extent of its influence. No sooner had a view of the connexion of religion with a truly noble mental training and with social life, been given in this masterpiece of German style, which was received with a loud and universal shout of joy, and no sooner had the feelings of this relation been properly impressed upon the souls of men, than the old intolerant theories were obliged to give way in all the provinces of Germany, if we except parts of Cologne, Treves, Munster, Paderborn and Bavaria, into which no ray of the new literature had yet forced its way. The operation and effects of the new literature, which originated with Lessing, and whose spirit is revealed in 'Nathan,' was so strong, that even Frederick William the Second, Wöllner and his associates were unable by force and law to change the feeling of the people, or bring back the old and blind faith; this first took place when Lessing and his work were banished by an artificial literature.

'Nathan' was expressly shortened and arranged for the stage, in order to introduce the new life by means of the eye also into the soul; and by means of versification, style, language and representation, the hateful side of a life was made most impressive upon the stage,—a life in which every man judges his neighbour, not according to his conduct but according to his faith, and priests and hypocrites oppress and tyrannize over the free man. In 'Nathan,' in the course of the action itself, the old mechanical religious exercise is brought before the eye and understanding in contrast with love, the true and pure religiousness of the heart, in the events and incidents of common life. Because Lessing appeared to agree with the reviewers of theological writings in the 'Universal German Library,' and with the educators and moralists, there was need of such a man as Herder to uphold the poetry of religion, and to tread a middle path between the fanaticism of Lavater and the philosophy of Lessing. We have already pointed out what Herder's tendencies were, and for this reason placed Lessing and Herder in the present volume, and at the same time opposed the one to the other. Herder, who was intimately connected with Hamann, had taken this direction in order to make the best of his poetical thoughts. Before he took his journey to France, or was acquainted with Göthe, as a

poet, as a master of the Hebrew language and literature, as a judge of taste and a critic, he was among the founders of a new German language and literature, and by a peculiar description of prose, written with great genius but altogether different from that of Lessing, he had become the head of a new theological and æsthetic school. When he became acquainted with Göthe, their two opposite natures appeared at first disposed to unite, and they offered a gentle opposition to the North German school, and against Lessing; and Herder, in connexion with Göthe, wrote the fugitive 'Sheets for the Improvement of German Manner and Art.' His employment in Bückeburg however gave him quite another direction.

As we are able with confidence to refer to Gervinus's work with respect to Herder also, we shall content ourselves with some gleanings from his works, and with what is more immediately connected with our plan and object than with those of the author of the poetical literature, who must keep questions of taste more in his eye than it is necessary for us to do. As a clergyman in Bückeburg Herder applied himself to theology, and had his views directed towards Göttingen; but his poetic mind, which quickly but superficially seized upon every species of knowledge, and gave everything a poetic form, was by no means well fitted for learned academical studies. Herder was unable to pursue the necessary historical or scientific studies of a properly learned theologian with sufficient application and assiduity, because, before and at the time in which he thought of a situation as a theological teacher, he was creating the most surprising works from knowledge hastily collected, and in the most various departments with all that decision which was peculiar to him. In reference to the religion of the people, in which point of view we consider his character and influence in connexion with that of Lessing, he was by no means favourable to the innovators of his age; but he gave, at the same time, an entirely new form to the old system, in a manner peculiar to himself.

The orthodox adherents of the old system were at first almost as much dissatisfied with Herder as they had been with Lessing, and this showed itself particularly when Heyne was anxious to bring him to Göttingen. The objection to this step was not only that he was deficient in the necessary theological learning, but that he was also strongly suspected of heresy. He was soon afterwards invited to Weimar by the Court; but as the

people of the town, according to custom, must also give their consent to his admission into the office, which he was invited to accept, many suspicions were expressed by them also as to his soundness in the faith. It was singular enough that Herder, at the very same time, was engaged in bitter controversies with the better part of the Berlin Rationalists and especially with Spalding. He himself afterwards became sensible that he had sinned against Spalding, and publicly recalled his vehement expressions. Herder's vehemence, in his poetical exaggeration, often led him to forget all respect towards those upon whom nature had only conferred ordinary prosaic souls. Nothing, however, was less capable of being brought into harmony, than Michaelis's profane and classical method of expounding the sacred books of the Old Testament, and Herder's oriental soaring and inspiration for the oldest Hebrew poetry ; or Schlözer's dry, cold, and in some measure Russian method of history, and Herder's manner of poetically uniting in the flights of fancy things which historically speaking were as remote from one another as the east is from the west. His attacks upon both these writers were therefore bitter and vehement. In his treatise upon the ' Oldest Records of the Human Race,' he was in the highest degree unjust towards Michaelis, because they had entered upon a wholly different field ; each therefore might have pursued his own path without molesting the other, and each have been and continued distinguished in his department. Schlözer was accustomed to treat his antagonists in no very mild manner, and Herder's attacks upon him in the Frankfort learned journals immediately threw him into such a rage, that he continued ever afterwards to be Herder's enemy. The poetic mind and feeling of the latter led him on good grounds to despise and persecute the Göttingen prose, which admitted and approved of nothing except what was palpable, and could endure only what was immediately useful. This was the case even with Meiners : his relation towards the Göttingen literati was precisely the same as that in which he stood to the orthodox. The latter would only hear of the prose of their catchisms, the former only of that which corresponded to their peculiar views of life, or which Meiners brought together by his compilations. Herder on the contrary was for poetry in everything, the creations and flights of his own fancy : he was therefore an opponent of the Berlin school, as well as of Lessing and the Göttingen youths, and also of the

Hanoverian and orthodox prose. All this is manifest from his 'Oldest Records of the Human Race.'

Herder was justly excited against the profoundly learned Michaelis: he believed him to have been guilty of extinguishing the last sparks of poetry and youthful fire which remained in the souls of the Göttingen theologians, by his expositions of the Old Testament, which were intermixed with common witticisms and anecdotes, with political economy and administration, with notices of all possible things connected with external life. He therefore wrote his 'Oldest Records,' in opposition both to the old orthodox system, and to the new views of the Göttingen oracles, and explained the first chapter of Genesis as a primitive, poetical, philosophical record or allegory. At a time when every man was busy modernizing the Bible, his rich fancy thus furnished him with means of reforming the faith of the people, of defending and maintaining this faith, without hypocrisy or sophistry, because he was led captive by his own fancy, and powerfully influenced and dragged others along with him. He soon found a large number of adherents to his poetical religion, which he wished to elevate to the rank of a philosophical one, among those who regarded the fragmentist as frivolous, Bahrdr as a man devoid of taste, the Rationalists as reckless and superficial, and the defenders of the old faith as dull and standing quite in opposition to the demands and necessities of the age. The work appeared at the time in which Herder, in connexion with Göthe and his friends, was furnishing contributions to the Frankfort learned notices, and when, in union with Göthe, he had published his sheets upon 'German Manner and Art.' At this very time also there sprung up a new and nearer connexion between him and all those who wished to furnish a new element of support to the religion of the people, by means of a peculiar kind of poetry, visionary ideas and mysticism, to which Herder himself could be in no respect favourable, because he was clear in his conceptions of the nature of life. He therefore began anew a long correspondence with Hamann, and he was thereby led into an acquaintance and connexion with Claudius, who had been made wholly fanatical by the writings of St. Martin. He corresponded with Lavater; in common with Göthe he defended the wonderful productions of Jung-Stilling for the sake of the man; neither the orthodox however nor the intelligent Göthe were satisfied with the poetical records.

The relation in which the orthodox prose and the political religion which alone were known in Hanover and in London, stood to Herder's poetical conceptions, will be best seen from a letter which Heyne wrote, when he was interesting himself to promote Herder's removal to Göttingen, and when the Hanoverian rulers were obliged to refer to London on the subject. Herder had at first caused his 'Oldest Records,' &c., then his 'Interpretation of the New Testament from newly opened Eastern Sources,' and afterwards 'His Letters of the Two Brothers of Jesus,' to be printed, in order to prove that he was a theologian: these works gave offence. It is worth while to learn from Heyne, and important as a characteristic of the age of fermentation, in what manner Herder, who was full of zeal for the faith, could have given offence to the orthodox, to whom the symbolical books had precisely the same value and import in religion which the Code of Justinian had in their daily business. In his letter to Herder, Heyne expressly laments the narrow views of his high ruling lords in Hanover and in London, who would see no further or deeper into religious matters than their obstinate and narrow-minded king: he did this however in a manner completely characteristic, and with a dubious shrugging of his shoulders in reference to the situation in Göttingen.

Heyne remarks, that the manner in which Herder, in his works above mentioned, had sinned against two articles of the symbolical books, had given offence in Hanover and in London. By turning the first chapter of Genesis into an allegory, he had run counter to the article upon creation; and by not acknowledging Jude the author of the epistle which is contained in the New Testament, as an apostle, he had sinned against the article upon holy Scripture. Göthe objected to, and took offence at, this poetizing of the history of the Old Testament, upon other and better grounds, and satirized the mountebank alarm which was raised about Herder's new invention, which he had brought to light in his 'Oldest Records,' with as much severity as he did Bahrdr's 'Evangelists in modern apparel.*'

* The verses with respect to Bahrdr, which he by no means took amiss, are well known. As to Herder, our readers know that the reference is to him, when the Doctor cries out in the puppet-show:—

“Thut die Lichter aus,
Sind in einem honetten Haus.”

Then the man with the magic-lantern:—

“Lichter weg! mein Lämpchen nur
Nimmt sich sonst nicht aus.
Ins Dunkel da, Mesdames!”

Herder for some time laid aside his views of promoting this kind of poetical Biblical reform, tried his powers successfully in other departments, in a manner peculiar to, and to be pardoned in, him alone, and became the creator of an entirely new description of poetry, philosophy and history. As a poet, he published about this time one of the greatest masterpieces in our language, two volumes of national songs. He paved the way for his future poetical philosophy, by a successful competition, in answer to two questions proposed by the prosaic academies of München and Berlin. As to the two volumes of national songs, they contain the most popular and at the same time most remarkable and peculiar songs of different ages, transferred by him in a masterly style into the German language, but with a complete preservation of their own spirit. He undertook something of the same kind with the ‘Song of Solomon,’ and proved anew on this occasion that he laid much greater stress on his reputation as a distinguished poet, than upon that of being a genuine and pious Lutheran. The very title which he gave to a Scriptural book, though then himself a preacher, painfully calls Bahrtdt to recollection, and sounds as if he wished to invite the profane reader by a profane sign-board. The title runs thus,—‘Song of Love, or the oldest and most beautiful Songs of the East.’ The book in its new form was with justice admired as poetry, and was reckoned among classical works; but scarcely any one would regard it as a Scriptural book in this new dress, and without troubling himself about original text or poetry, would take his Luther in his hand. Herder’s peculiarity, his oriental soaring, his glowing fancy, and his mind always dwelling in foreign and ethereal regions, must necessarily suffer shipwreck whenever he ventured upon the New Testament; and this really occurred, when he undertook a translation of the book of Revelation, so peculiarly distinguished by its oriental character from all the other books of the New Testament. This translation, which was entitled ‘Maranatha, or the Coming of the Lord,’ was very little spoken of. Herder however continued, by means of a number of books, to make an opening for the entrance of his poetical views of the Jewish and Christian doctrines

And then the magic-lantern man sings the history of creation :—

“Ach wie sie is alles dunkel
Finsternis is.
War sie alle wüst und leer
Hab’ sie all’ nicks auf dieser Erde gesehe,” &c.

and histories, binding the new and the old together by the power of his fancy. Herder's Christianity found admirers and favourers among the higher classes, and among those who wished to renounce the old, without doing homage to the new, or who had too little power of understanding, too little historical and learned knowledge, to be able to follow Lessing, Plank, Spittler, Griesbach and others. In the pursuit of his plan, Herder next wrote his 'Letters upon the Study of Theology,' which appeared in 1780 and 1781. In these books directions were given to young theologians, as to the manner in which they might acquire those views of their science and of their spiritual calling which, according to Herder's opinion, would prevent them from becoming mere learned inquirers like Semler, or preachers of mere utility like Bahrdt, Campe, and the new school of educators.

Herder's 'Letters' came at a most seasonable time; for Semler's guide for young theologians had become antiquated, and Bahrdt and Campe did not write theirs till these 'Letters' of Herder, which appeared in four parts, had excited incredible attention in Germany, and gone through a second edition. Herder's guidance however rather led to winged progress than to quiet, leisurely and slow advancement; in his 'Letters' he gave both rules and models, but always more poetry than dogmatics and morals. According to his principles, theologians ought to cultivate their mind and taste, rather than form their understanding or strengthen their memory; without allowing themselves to indulge in controversy, they should treat questions of faith in such a manner, that their exposition should be adapted to the existing circumstances of mental culture and to the whole tendencies of the age, and this was to be effected by poetry. Herder's style in these 'Letters' is only suited to them when considered in this point of view; in other respects it was by no means as a style fitted for instruction, however original it may be, however his expositions are enlivened by fancy, and made entertaining by an intermixture of passages from his poetical translations of the sacred books.

We mention these 'Letters,' less in reference to theology, whose history we are not writing, than to the general improvement and progress of the nation, and the never-to-be-forgotten services which Herder rendered by upholding and infusing a poetical spirit into the German nation,—a spirit which strives after some-

thing which is above and beyond what is immediately useful, and which recognizes something divine in humanity. Historians, statistes, and philosophers, such as Meiners and Eberhardt, pedagogues and theological rationalists, all insisted that education should be wholly and entirely prosaic, directed always towards an external object and to some immediate utility; of all these and such views Herder was a strenuous opponent. When we compare Bahrdr's and Campe's suggestions and directions, which appeared shortly after Herder's 'Letters,' then we shall see and feel how beneficial it was that a poet, such as he was, should have infused some sparks of poetical life into the clergy. Bahrdr and Campe both wished to bring down the Protestant clergy to the standard of the people, and not to raise up the people to theirs: they were to be teachers of the people in this sense, that, being well provided with all sorts of knowledge fitted for the most common necessities, with a knowledge of natural history, the physical and economical sciences, they should be always ready, as able, economical, or medical advisers to show the people what was useful with respect to the management of their kitchens and cellars, their gardens and fields. Shortly after these 'Letters,' Herder wrote his treatise upon the spirit of Hebrew poetry, in which again poetry and religion were combined in the most splendid manner. By this attempt at combination, he often failed in both, sometimes introducing as a medium of connexion the one-sided rational innovators, and sometimes the irrational dogmatists who continued to cleave to what was old; he had nevertheless a great concourse of admirers and followers, till Kant's philosophy destroyed his influence. This spirit of Hebrew poetry is not properly speaking theological; and, if it awakened some poetical feeling among theologians and writers upon exegesis, it had for the most part a similar effect to that which Herder's previous historical labours had had, which appeared to awaken a philosophical historical sense in young writers and in the public in general, but which in reality led them altogether away from true historical ground. These views of Hebrew poesy increased the tendency of our nation, which is ever ready to turn from life and reality, and upon the winged steeds of fancy to fly into the land of fanaticism or romance, to yield itself up to the dreams of a vivid orientalism. Herder's spirit of Hebrew poetry taught exaggeration, and led to the limits of a territory, in which reason became dumb and

fanaticism reigned,—in which souls were received by Lavater and Jung-Stilling, and by them conducted to the moon. This however by no means deprives the work of its true value, nor is Herder to be made responsible for its effects. Its worth must not be regarded as depending upon the manner in which book-makers and educated geniuses used and applied it.

In the very beginning of the *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, there is an admirable indication of the manner in which the shepherd records of the first book of Moses are to be explained, in order certainly to arrive at a knowledge of the customs, modes of thinking, and poetry of any primitive people whatever. In the second part we are delighted to read the indications of a poet like Herder (for we cannot possibly recognize him as a philosopher, theologian, or historian), as to the manner in which the Hebrew poets can and ought to be read and treated, and their figurative language and poetry be developed and explained. In the second part he happily dropped the form of poetical dialogue, which he had adopted in the first, and which made it impossible for any one to follow him upon his genial course who is not endowed with a great power of imagination, or, what is the same, does not imagine that he is so; because, in books written in prose, people in general look for instruction addressed to the understanding, rather than for play of fancy. It is also very difficult to follow him in other parts, because, by Herder's all-ruling power of imagination, and his capacity of creative poetry, subjects are often intimately connected by ingenious combination, which, historically speaking, are immeasurably remote from each other. He ascribes to the Hebrews alone, all that belongs to the oriental nations in general, confounds chronology by his fancy, and mixes together the ancient and the modern. The same boldness, the same fancy to pronounce oracles from his ethereal elevation upon subjects of reason, shows itself in his attempt to combine the old revealed faith with a species of rationalism, in his judgements formed upon history, which are more matters of taste than the result of any solid principle or generally acknowledged rules; the great precipitancy which pervades all his works is especially remarkable in the last two parts of his '*Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*'.

In his '*Ideas upon the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*,' in four parts, history and philosophical theology are treated according to the manner in which both were bound to-

gether in Herder's fancy. The translation of this work into French, in our days, is connected with the extension among the French people of the German romanticism, which wonderfully enough was formed quite after the fashion which prevailed beyond the Rhine. Herder's 'Ideas' must indeed be regarded as light in darkness, among those to whom Chateaubriand's or even Victor Hugo's and Alexander Dumas's writings appear rational and logical, among whom their bounds and their conceits seem beautiful, among whom the miraculous pantheism of other romancers and their absurd praises of the middle ages appear natural. An historical criticism of Herder's 'Ideas' does not fall within our purpose; we have only therefore to give some hints with respect to their relation to the then reigning, humorous, romantic, pretending manner which is now also the fashion in France; further information must be sought for in the history of German poetry. The 'Ideas,' apart from history and its mode of treatment, must have well supplied a want of the great public, and therefore have been useful; for innumerable histories have been written in the same manner, and in our own days the application of poetry and philosophy to facts, dry in themselves, has been driven much beyond the point to which it was ever carried by Herder. Scholars who, right or wrong, seek to write a prosaic history, which shall be regulated and bound by intelligible laws resting upon chronological and logical foundations, can have no judgement about the 'Ideas,' or about histories composed in such a fashion, because they are deficient in the necessary poetical or philosophic inspiration to write, or even to understand, such works. We shall however briefly go through the single parts, in order to show the new species of history Herder created by means of these 'Ideas.'

In the very first book he comes to definite conclusions upon subjects to which, since his time, astronomers, natural philosophers, geologists, ethnographers, aided by the light of advancing science and modern and enlarged experience, have given quite a different complexion from that which it was possible for him to give, from books hastily and superficially read, that were either recommended to him by persons acquainted with the subjects, or which accident may have thrown in his way. He imposed upon his contemporaries, and upon persons ignorant of the various departments of learning of which he professed to treat, by the decisiveness and confidence of a prophet, with which he

ventured to pronounce judgement upon the darkest and most difficult points in the language of the oriental prophets, which are sometimes not to be explained. In the third and fourth books he presumes to rule with authority upon the field of natural philosophy, in things to which others have devoted the whole of their lives, without being able to arrive at any clear and definite conclusions; here he plays the character of a philosopher, and then passes on to a kind of theology which is altogether of his own creation. This species of theology, which has lately proved very acceptable to the French romantic school, which was dreaming about some peculiar sort of pantheism, Herder placed in opposition to the crude orthodoxy of Bossuet, on the one hand, which teaches that the Divine Providence takes none, or only an occasional concern and oversight of hundreds of nations and thousands of millions of individual men, and connects the whole history and course of the universe with the Jews; and, on the other hand, to the wonderful theories of Bonnet and other exaggeratedly pious teleologists and natural theologians. Trusting to inspiration in the real and exact sciences also, Herder, in his third book, without having any pretensions to be an investigator of nature, or even to be well acquainted with her works, attempts to establish a progression or gradation of creatures,—an attempt which would presuppose an amazing knowledge of the departments of the natural kingdom, if any one who was desirous of treating the subject prosaically should undertake the task. That which he aims at in his fourth book might be more easily accomplished, viz. to deduce the rational faculties of man from his organization; but Herder ventures here to stray far beyond the historical field of proof, and deduces the tendencies of man to humanity and religion from his outward form, which, as a fact, is certain enough, but which no anatomist or physiologist would venture to prove. All this may be allowed; but when he deduces also his hope of immortality from this position, the question belongs to theology or asceticism. In the fifth book he proceeds at length to draw a conclusion from what has preceded, on which he proposes to found a new theological view of history, totally different from that of Bossuet. From all that has been premised he deduces the proposition, that man is a member of two worlds.

At the time of the first appearance of these ideas, which drove the public altogether out of their senses, a well-read and

profound-thinking naturalist pronounced a judgement upon the contents of the first part, which was at once striking and solid : "The boldness with which Herder prescribes to anatomists and naturalists what they should investigate, and how they should follow out their investigations, must extort a smile from the quiet and thoughtful reader." The second part, or from the sixth to the tenth book, contains a number of oracular phrases and notices, collected from hastily read books of voyages and travels, propounded with extraordinary boldness and fancy, and clothed in the same manner in new and pompous language, as results had been given in the first part drawn from the works of naturalists. In this part the oldest records are again introduced with full oriental splendour, as furnishing an explanation of the first chapter of Genesis, as a primitive and not merely as a Herderian notion ; and sciences, arts, government, are all poetically and authoritatively derived from a long chain of cultivation or from a tradition of the primitive world, without anywhere giving the slightest proof of its existence. But as Herder's readers never asked after reasons, or only found them inconvenient or tedious, after he had once established this chain of tradition, it was very easy to make religion the oldest and most sacred of the numerous inherited traditions. When the subject is closely examined, it will be readily seen, that the miserable herd who had remained true to their old systems, and at a later time Wöllner and his creatures, whom he had everywhere appointed as members of the consistories, and who clung to the symbolical books, had no reason to rejoice in the services which Herder had rendered to their cause, but must rather have been of opinion that he had collected a band of fanciful heretics, still more numerous than that of the intelligent heretics of Lessing's school, or that of the rationalists whom he opposed. For if tradition be the genuine source of religion, and if we do not look through Herder's spectacles, we must be infallibly led by history to the pantheism of the primitive world. There is nothing but pantheism to be found among all the oldest races in India, Persia, Egypt and China,—pantheism in all their mysteries, symbols and worship ; and of a tradition of the unity and personality of the God of Christians there is no trace.

Herder knew his public much too well to allow himself to be disturbed. They imagined that they flew with him, although they stood far below him, and only gazed with astonishment as

they looked at him soaring aloft: he therefore boldly flies over all symbolic pantheism and fire-worship, past all the worship of the Indians and Persians, and mounted on his winged Pegasus proceeds direct to Moses. This transition has some similarity to the poetical manner in which Dante, in his poem, causes the Devil by a stroke of Virgil's wand to pass beyond the centre of gravitation to the regions of Purgatory, far beyond the centre of earth and hell. Herder knew well also how to disburden himself of oriental ballast to suit the occasion; and after having previously deduced everything which relates to the spiritual nature of man from a primitive tradition, he passes over all these traditions, which are indisputably older than the books of Moses, in such a manner, as at last to be free of all the others, and to find only that one which he wishes to find.

In another work, he himself, with that exaggeration which is peculiar to him, has extolled the 'Zend Avesta' as the record and source of the most sacred tradition. But his views on that point are here pushed into the shade, and Moses, adorned with a pearly crown of the newest science, is presented to all those who look on from a dark corner at Herder's brilliant exhibition. The whole of the discoveries of the most recent period in natural science, as far as a naturally very deficient acquaintance with it extends, are all laid down in the Mosaic history of the Creation, which in this sense he regards as a revelation. He shows the boldness of his conceptions and views, in despite of orthodoxy and the sense of the words, by explaining "Let there be light," as found in the text of the Mosaic record, on behalf of a geological revelation, in the sense of the Parsees, or fire-worshippers. Under the word *light*, according to him, there is to be understood some undefined elementary fire, which the nature of things has brought into existence and formed.

These notions we regard as sufficient to point out the place which Herder held among the great men to whom our nation was so much indebted in the eighteenth century. It will be obvious, from the passages which have been adduced, and which we shall call facts given, what importance Herder's writings, which were numerous, widely circulated, written with enthusiasm, and read by enthusiastic persons, had for his time; and it will be easy to indicate the nature of their operation, without the necessity of dwelling longer upon the subject. We shall point out in the following period the position which Herder held when

Kant's philosophy was disseminated ; whilst Göthe and Schiller did it homage in a manner calculated to promote their own views, he believed himself strong enough to swim against the stream, by which his relation to literature was altogether altered. Next to and in connexion with Herder, we must now mention Lavater, because they praised and recommended one another, and their manner and influence were of a similar kind, only with this difference, that they had very different classes of men in their eye, and by their writings led very different persons to a love for religious inspiration. Herder's readers consisted of the educated classes, of all those who could no longer digest the old faith in the form in which it was preached to them by Göze and those who were like-minded, but could not at the same time make up their minds altogether to renounce the forms which they had learned in their youth, and who therefore wished to have something analogous to the old faith, but in reality something new under the old forms. Lavater was the oracle of all those who were anxious to combine the tone of reigning sensibility in the minds of those who were melted by Werther and Siegwart, either with religious fanaticism, like Klopstock's friends, or to substitute religious fanaticism for an affectation of sensibility, like those of whom Jung-Stilling was the apostle.

Lavater's first appearance in public life has been noticed at length in the preceding period ; we therefore take him up again in the present, as one of the most distinguished men of his time, who from various sides, and by means of various qualities, exercised a most important influence upon his fellow-countrymen and upon the whole of Germany. Lavater was celebrated as a preacher, poet and writer in the affectedly clever and sentimentally declamatory manner so much admired by the friends of Klopstock* ; he soon became acquainted with all the world, and was as vain, although not so insolent, as his friend and fellow-countryman Zimmerman in Hanover, who contributed very largely to gain a name for him amongst his numerous and distinguished friends. Zimmerman was physician to the king in Hanover. With his skill in his profession we have no concern ; certain it

* As we take for granted that Gervinus's history of German poetical literature of the eighteenth century is in the hands of our readers, we avoid repeating here what is there so admirably said. We only therefore slightly point out Lavater's influence, like that of the humourists, geniuses of power, Jung-Stilling and others, because Gervinus has stated at length and with solid judgement what should be known on the subject.

is, however, that he understood admirably well to supply all his deficiencies in the medical art by clever charlatanism; and in this way he had gained for himself some renown in the fine arts by hard Swiss prose intermixed with bombast, and in the then much cultivated popular philosophy, in which everybody could dabble. When he had gained a considerable reputation in the polite world, he acted as those like him are universally accustomed to act; he trumpeted the praises of his friend, and Lavater reciprocated his good offices. Both speedily became renowned, and were regarded as oracles by those who are accustomed blindly to follow certain authorities. Lavater never spoke otherwise than in the tone of a prophet, because he was accustomed to consider all his thoughts as divine inspirations, and Zimmerman's pride and presumption never suffered him to entertain the smallest doubt of the infallibility of his claims.

The intimacy between Zimmerman and Lavater led to the great reputation to which the latter attained as discoverer of a new science, which in our days has been obliged to yield to craniology and phrenology, to advocate which numerous phrasemakers have been found such as Lavater. The new science was no other than physiognomy, which had been empirically followed and cultivated since the beginning of the world, and is still ardently pursued, but always with consideration and thought; Lavater however wished to raise it to the rank of an infallible prophetic science. Zimmerman was very favourably inclined to this discovery, and was well suited to introduce to the public notice a system closely bordering upon magnetism and charlatanism, and related to medical science. He was the physician of the fashionable world, consulted at all the neighbouring courts, a knight of many orders, and a member of several academies; he was therefore best calculated to raise other adventurous aéronauts by the wind which he himself had raised, and by which, like Voltaire, he had become a correspondent of the Empress Catherine of Russia. Lavater was highly esteemed as a visionary genius by all the great, who love the appearance of piety precisely so much the more as they are far removed from its reality; he therefore found abundant support, when he, like Basedow, offered them splendid pictures and a new science in return for their gold. Lavater, like Basedow also, required all the world to receive this science, which had been discovered by him, and which was quite indispensable for the promotion of the

best interests of mankind. Both made their science, and through it mankind, dependent upon a magnificent work to be published by themselves; and Lavater found numerous subscribers for his work upon physiognomy, as Basedow had done for his elementary book.

As to physiognomy, the world of the saloons were the less able to distinguish this science from something well-founded and real, as very skilful and distinguished fashionable talkers and declaimers always undertake the protection and defence of such things—as has been the case with magnetism, craniology, phrenology and water-cures—the charlatanism of wonder-workers and manipulators. Both Zimmerman and Lavater admirably understood, each in his way, how to boast and to swagger, and to give their copper, by a very thin coating, the appearance of genuine gold. They went hand in hand like brothers, in the dissemination of a science which answered their purpose so exceedingly well. Lavater first announced his physiognomical gospel to his Zürich flock, and appeared to be filled with terror when Zimmerman began to proclaim it in his German market; but he was afterwards delighted, when he perceived that all who assembled around Zimmerman's stage turned also to the wonderful Doctor Lavater. Lavater read essays before his Zürich friends in their natural-history society, in which he treated of physiognomy in that exaggerated and bombastic manner which was peculiar to him, which was the taste of the time, and especially of the friends of Lavater in South and in North Germany. Zimmerman, through the pages of the Hanoverian magazine, in 1772, communicated this essay which had been sent to him to the whole of the numerous admirers of the Zürich prophet in North Germany. In the commencement Lavater expressed some concern lest the pious souls in North Germany, who had admired the poetic prose of his 'Views into Eternity,' and honoured him as a prophet, should take offence at the subject communicated to them by Zimmerman, as a profane thing; but he no sooner observed that the publication took effect, than he thought better of it.

As soon as Lavater saw that his essay had made a great sensation in Germany, he not only sent the lecture which had been made known by Zimmerman to press, and published it as a book, but he added a second part, in which he presented a summary view of the whole of his science. In this second part he

comes forward expressly in the character of a prophet, for he announces as a new truth what has been known to all men as a matter of old experience, viz. the power of guessing at the qualities of the mind and heart from a consideration of the features of the countenance. This was raised by him to the dignity of an infallible science, by means of which the character and dispositions of every man may be divined from his external appearance. He arranged the principles of his science into a system, the first part of which was to comprehend what he calls empiric physiognomy: to the second part he gives the name of theoretic or transcendental physiognomy, which was to indicate the reasons and grounds, or explain the immediate connexion between the inward character and the outward expression. Lavater's book, as a prospectus of his great work, which was to be illustrated by engravings and brought out with all possible typographic splendour, was circulated by him and his friend Zimmerman everywhere among the rich, among the lovers and seekers after exaggerated novelties, who were then very numerous; and among the ladies; and the subscription to the great work was as successful as that which was raised for Basedow's elementary work. Subscriptions came in not only from all parts of Germany, but from Denmark, France, Sweden, and even Russia, through the favour of the Empress; wherever fancy and its arbitrary flights, which disdain every logical law, were more in vogue than mathematical severity, or quiet thoughtful examination, people eagerly subscribed to the seer, in whose work many who cherished the expectation of seeing themselves shine in engraving or vignettes among the high, noble and divine countenances which were there to be introduced, sent their portraits or sketches, or even made pilgrimages in person to Zürich.

As the learned, like the rest of the world, are accustomed to form their opinion about the excellence of a work only from the passages which are presented to the public in a series of daily newspapers or monthly magazines, or from the reputation of the man who has recommended it, we must not here overlook a testimony which was borne in favour of the new science, as we shall hereafter speak at some length of what was said against it by a great mathematician and naturalist, and unquestionably the greatest satirist in Germany. The clever Madame Dudevant, usually known as George Sand, lately fell in accidentally with

Lavater's work as she was travelling, and in her admirable book, 'The Letters of a Traveller,' has described her admiration of it in a masterly style. Whoever wishes to hear Lavater and his physiognomy praised, must read the surprise and astonishment which this lady so admirably expresses, whose judgement is the more unbiassed, as her religious opinions are the very opposite of those which were held by Lavater, and as she knew nothing of him personally. We must have some experience of the manner in which people of genius, who are ruled by fancy, judge, in order to explain the possibility of Lavater's declamations and exclamations; his engravings and their explanation having made such an impression upon his contemporaries, that Lichtenberg and all the able and intelligent men in the country thought it worth while to oppose and resist its progress by all the means in their power.

The first two volumes of this work, which had raised such magnificent expectations, and which was graced with a title conceived and expressed in all the pride of humility, appeared in 1775 and 1776, and in 1778 the whole four volumes were before the public. The title runs as follows: 'Physiognomical Fragments, for the Promotion of the Knowledge of Mankind and of Universal Love.' The form is large quarto: the work is illustrated and adorned by numerous engravings and vignettes, and in point of paper and typography far surpassed everything which had previously been issued from the German press. However much may be said for and against physiognomy, so much is quite clear, that Lavater was not the man who was able to raise divination to the rank of a science, in which the same confidence might be placed in the skilful augur of the human features as was formerly placed in the Roman augurs, who inspected the viscera of sacrificed animals. He was destitute of the two qualities most essential for such a man. The first quality necessary for a man who wishes to found a science upon experience, is the power of long, patient, modest and quiet observation; the second is intimately connected with it,—the power of giving a strictly logical and orderly exposition, in definite and clear words, of what has been observed, and the connexion of the phenomena with the results deduced. Lavater's manner, however, is the theological manner of those who dare to speak to us in the name of God, or of the philosophers of the school of redundancy and genius, who, since the time of Herder, have looked upon them-

selves as so far elevated above the common world, that they let fall dogmatical judgements from the clouds instead of reasons, and dignified contempt instead of refutation. This tone prevails to an immense extent; it shows itself in every page of Lavater's apparently humble Christian writings; in politics it is the staple commodity of the absolutists and Carlists amongst all the stone-blind supporters of obsolete principles, as well as of the raving democrats of the school of Marat; in theology it is the prevailing feeling among the bigoted Papists, and among fanatics like Lavater and the Pietists, as it was and is with dry moralists, like Nicolai, with the bold and intolerant scoffers of the school of Diderot and Voltaire. Men of all these kinds despair from the very beginning of the validity of their arguments; and, because they wish to rule by means of authoritative dogmas alone, they are mild and gentle to those who will patiently listen and receive, but against all others they are bitter and venomous. Every man who will not swallow their prescriptions unconditionally, or repeat their dogmas with an humble faith, is immediately declared incapable of judging of their principles or allegations, because these are much too high for his weak judgement to reach.

Because this manner of confuting an opponent by the bombast of loud-sounding language, from which, alas! Herder was far from being free, has prevailed from the time of Lavater's physiognomy till the present day, notwithstanding all the ridicule and exposure which was heaped upon it by Lichtenberg, and because it is yet far from having fallen into disuse, by quoting a few passages we shall exemplify the manner in which Lavater employed this bombast and ridiculous tone, of which all the enemies of reason afterwards availed themselves. We select the passage which first presents itself, because all the four quartos are pervaded by the same tone. In this passage (Part i. p. 171) all those are enumerated who are and will remain unworthy and incapable of receiving this new science, so indispensable to the human race. The passage runs thus:—"Whoever can find no resting-place for his foot in Bodmer's ark (which, we may remark, had been long before that time wrecked upon Mount Ararat),—whoever does not see in Klopstock's apostles the noblest models of humanity, and in his Eloah the archangel,—whoever does not feel that his Christ at Somma is the godman,—all to whom Göthe is only witty, Herder

only obscure, and Haller only hard," &c., after proceeding in this way through several sentences, in the end he concludes, that all such are incapable of receiving the principles of his science*. The burlesque manner in which Lavater poured out a stream of bombastic language about his work, its engravings and vignettes, which all the men of genius of his time, and all tender and sympathizing souls found so delightful, will be made clear from the passages which we shall subjoin, accompanied by Lichtenberg's satire†.

The great ones of the earth, however, sent sketches and pictures of themselves, in order to become the ideal of virtues, for

* Lichtenberg afterwards ridiculed this passage in his exposition of the sketch of a pig's tail, whose bendings he had marked by letters, as Lavater had done the features of the human face. He commences thus: "If, dear reader, thou dost not see in this tail, the devil in the nature of the pig (although there is a higher swinish impulse at *a*),—if thou dost not perceive the terror of Israel in *c*,—if thou dost not smell with thine eyes, as if thou hadst thy nose therein, the filthy mud in which it delights at *d*,—and if thou dost not seem to go into the refuse of nature, and the abhorrence of all nations and people, which were his element—shut up my book. Thou art lost for physiognomy. This pig, in other respects an original genius, delighted to wallow the whole day through in his filthy mud," &c.

† "Physiognomy," says Lavater in his bombast, "draws heart to heart: it alone is the foundation of enduring friendships. Friendship can rest upon no more irrefragable foundation, or upon no more firm-set rocks than upon the vaulting of a brow, the curvature of a nose, the dimensions of a mouth, the glance of an eye," &c. In another passage the appearance of two ugly vagrants brings to a close a physiognomical dream in a most burlesque manner, which dream he has described in his ridiculous poetical prose: "Full of delight before a bed of the most splendid flowers, &c. In this delighted feeling I mounted in my thoughts to the living beauties of the animal world, and onward to man; a noble image of humanity was before my face, which my heart embraced with high delight; a rushing noise interrupted my vision—God! with what melancholy horror the image struck me! I saw two vagrants before me!!" Lichtenberg in his bitter strain satirizes this manner of Lavater's which he applied to the sketches of those whom he wished to praise. The satirist selects in this case the tail of an English mastiff as his subject of illustration. He begins thus: "Dear reader, and friend of human souls, who embracest all nature in the warmth of thy benevolent heart, who devoteest thy thoughts with devotional reverence to all her works, meditate on this dog's tail, and acknowledge that if Alexander had wished to wear a tail, he might not have been ashamed of such a one as this;—nothing effeminately lapdoggish, no ladylike sweet caressing, no mouse-catching diminutive nature; all is manhood, authoritative bearing, a high and elevated bend, a quiet, thoughtful, power-harboursing rigidity, equally far from servile crouching between his legs, and fowl-hunting, game-tracking, anxious, irresolute horizontality. Drive out humanity; truly the sceptre of the world should fall to these tails. Who does not feel in the bending at *a*) a doghood bordering on human greatness? In position how near the earth, in dignity how near to heaven! Love, delights of the heart, nature, if thou wilt at any time adorn thy masterpiece with a tail, hear the prayer of thy devoted servant even to fanaticism, and bestow upon him one like B." &c.

there are very many who have no lack of beauty of person who are but little renowned for the greatness of their virtues. Among the monarchical favourites we think upon Orloff and the Duchess de Dino (Talleyrand); among the democratical Theroigne de Mericourt. Lavater could carve out and dispense features and virtues enough, which indeed he did not fail to do. In Lavater's book there are found a great many delineations of living persons of all nations, and the connexion of the character of the favoured individual with his outward lineaments was scientifically developed to the world.

The whole of Germany rejoiced to find that the country contained in its bosom so many faces full of soul, that it nourished so many noble specimens of humanity, that the fashionable and distinguished who had sent their pictures were models of virtue and genius, that there were so many invaluable men and women, as Lavater in his commentary upon their likenesses had announced.

This new science, which Lavater understood so well how to disseminate and make acceptable, soon became as prevailing as the Siegewart sensibility had been. Even in Lower Saxony, to which many a cold blast came from Göttingen, the followers of the warm Zürich school might be reckoned by thousands; and this gave rise to an opposition, which is in the highest degree deserving of attention as connected with the progress of our literature. The opposition of the clever and witty among the scientific men of Germany in the eighteenth century or age against the obscure and servile spirit of Zimmerman and the fanaticism of Lavater is peculiarly important, as having led to the introduction of genuine satire, and given it a home in Germany, instead of that coarse wit and rude abuse, which were formerly the only weapons of attack or defence, and which Zimmerman employed on this occasion in his reply to Lichtenberg. Lichtenberg was nearly related in mind and genius to Hogarth, as whose interpreter he has gained such high renown by his brief but clever notices; by his intimate acquaintance with Shakspeare, and as his eulogist, he also contributed largely to make the Germans alive to the conventional weakness and artificiality of the French drama, which had been adopted by them. His cold nature, which was neither continuously obedient to strict moral principles nor to deep religious feeling, though occasionally under the influence of both, fitted him to be the antagonist of all that non-

sense of sentimentality, of fanaticism, and of bombast, which then ruled the world, and to annihilate the advocates by his severe pointed wit. Lichtenberg was especially distinguished above all the German scholars, who might in some respects be compared with him in mathematical or physical knowledge as well as in acquaintance with belles lettres, by never having abused his reputation to make a bookmaking speculation of the reading public. Even Göthe and Schiller, as we learn from their correspondence, did not think this beneath their dignity; and Herder, as the number of his writings prove, thought it quite a matter of course. Lichtenberg did not write numerous and thick volumes, even when the circumstances of the times demanded it; he did not one while affect speculative philosophy, and at another piety, universal knowledge, and wondrous sensibility, as many manufacturers of clever books and novels did. He neither gesticulated, like the so-called humourists, as if he were half a fool, nor did he like them write an unintelligible language. We must pay the more attention to his contest with the numerous phantasiasts of his time, because it will be best seen from the circumstances connected with it, and especially from his own treatises, to what an incredible extent the German public and its literature had become and continued to be the mere tools of charlatans and learned brotherhoods, who trumpeted each other's praises in newspapers and journals, but who now happily are again at enmity with one another. Even a great mind like Lichtenberg's could not succeed against the vain band of screaming fanatics, but was obliged to submit to be abused and defamed by an insolent apostle of servility, who was neither capable of a sound thought nor of writing in a tolerable style,—we mean the miserable Zimmerman, who attacked and abused him in the 'German Museum,' called him a calendar-maker, a mannikin, and such vulgar epithets*. The connexion of Lichtenberg's satire with the noise which the physiognomists, magnetizers, Gassner, and Cagliostro made in Germany at the end of the seventh decennium of the eighteenth century, is as follows.

In September 1777, Lichtenberg undertook the labour of editing the 'Göttingen Pocket Calendar,' which afterwards became so distinguished. It was ornamented by small engravings, and accompanied by short and witty essays, and had been formerly edited by Ersleben, his predecessor in the professorship of natu-

* Lichtenberg was deformed.—TRANS.

ral philosophy. He opened the new series of the 'Calendar' with an admirable satirical and philosophical treatise against physiognomy, considered as a science, in which he tore to rags all the phrases of Lavater and Zimmerman, who were desirous of giving physiognomy a scientific form. He afterwards published this treatise separately, in January 1778, and declares expressly in the preface, that it was by no means his desire to attempt to refute this well-known and wide-spread work. Whoever wished to do this, must not at least undertake the task in 16mo, or address himself to readers by whom a large 4to is looked upon as quite as good as a demonstration. I only wished, he adds, to meet and guard against some dangerous conclusions, which youths and matrons already occasionally begin to deduce from this work. I wished to prevent men from following the practice of physiognomy for the promotion of the love of mankind, as people were formerly scorched and burned to promote the love of God. In a later answer to Zimmerman's rude abuse, which, as Lichtenberg expresses himself, Zimmerman had prefixed to the thoughts of Moses Mendelsohn sent for from Berlin, he gives some admirable elucidations of the condition in which German literature was at that time, and into which it again appears likely to fall.

"My readers," he says, "must pay no respect to names,—these are nothing : they must not, like a French abbé or an English clergyman, see *who* it is that speaks, but *what* he says. Besides, in the midst of the growing spirit of newspaper and journal reading, the reputation of a fine writer in Germany is the most contemptible possession on earth. By the aid of a little correspondence, a few pompous panegyrical letters, and a skilful friend to reciprocate the incense which has been strewed, thousands gain the distinction of a guard of honour before their little house, and the name of a fine writer. This however in the end is only millipedes' luck ; they are called millipedes, and have only fourteen feet ;—that is, one cannot count, a second does not see why he should, and a third is not disposed to trouble himself with an account of these confounded little feet. The naturalist who has counted them sits still, makes no alteration in the common usage of language, but says to himself withal that 'The millipede has only fourteen feet.'"

As happily, in our times, no man has any longer an idea to what extent, in the eighteenth century the good-humoured Germans,

to use no stronger phrase, were the sport of the miserable arts of such men as Zimmerman, who forced his acquaintance upon Frederic II., the Empress Catherine, upon all the princes and great men of the land, spoke and wrote French, and had their portraits and sketches bestrewed with bombast by Lavater,—as no man can now conceive what an immense reputation these men enjoyed, and what merit therefore Lichtenberg had, in opening the eyes of the public to the scandalous manner in which their prejudices and their simplicity were abused,—we shall refer in a note to a book in which Marcard eulogizes his protector Zimmerman as the wonder of the world*. Zimmerman was conscious that he must not enter into a controversy upon rational principles with Lichtenberg; he had heard however that Moses Mendelsohn had said something in favour of physiognomy, but neither in favour of Lavater nor against Lichtenberg. He caused these reasons to be sent to him from Berlin, as Lichtenberg expresses it, and printed them in the March number of the German Museum (1778). But the insolent, servile Bernese courtier prefixed, by way of introduction to the four printed pages of Mendelsohn's remarks, two pages against Lichtenberg, full of abuse and ill-breeding, and composed in such a bad, vulgar, and schoolboy-like style, that whoever reads them will be at a loss to comprehend how a man who could have written two such pages could ever have become renowned. Lichtenberg replied to Zimmerman's paper in a short satirical letter, which, in consequence of its masterly wit, in reference to the fashionable world, to an ostentatious display of reputation obtained by sneaking after titles, orders, the favour of the Orloffs, and of the great of all sorts, gained by flattery and influence at court, is quite as remarkable as Lessing's eleven *Anti-Gözes*, in reference to protestantism and monachism. This letter, and Lessing's fugitive pieces against Göze, are the most vehement specimens which the German language contains in that species of eloquence and bitter irony directed against single individuals, and are at the same time free from all personal abuse. Lichtenberg and Lessing employed

* Zimmerman's Correspondence with the Empress Catherine II., and with Mr. Weikard: together with a number of original Letters of the Empress, by H. M. Marcard, body-physician in Oldenburg, and first physician in Pymont. Bremen, Carl Seyffert, 1803. It will be difficult to find a more servile and scandalously boasting book, but it shows what the favour of the great and the empty reputation of those times were. After the Doctor, the chief witness in favour of Zimmerman is Orloff.

very different styles of satire and of cutting language, but both are perfect in their kind. Our language therefore was enriched, almost at the same time, with Herder's prose writings, already referred to, Göthe's 'Werther,' Lessing's 'Eleven Anti-Gözes,' and Lichtenberg's Polemical Satires against Lavater's manner and Zimmerman's person, and all in different styles. Every one who is acquainted with human nature will see, that Lichtenberg was as little able as Lessing to alter the tendency of the Germans to put themselves in leading-strings and to be led by names. We see daily in Germany, as well as in Paris and London, how people determine a man's worth according to sounding phrases, journals, newspapers, orders, titles and acquaintances; and how men put blind faith in raving zealots. Lessing's and Lichtenberg's writings experienced the fate of all wisdom; but even the writings of prophets and apostles were unable to keep the human race upon the way of salvation.

In this letter Lichtenberg speaks of Moses Mendelsohn with the greatest respect, and directs all his bitterness against Zimmerman, on account of his gross and rude introduction. He says, with great wit, the treatise, combined with the introduction, made such an impression upon him as he never remembers to have experienced in any previous part of his life except once—when a psalter was given into his hands bound up with Till's 'Merry Jester.' He adds, that Mendelsohn's Essay has no bearing upon him, that he had had no intention of contending against physiognomy in itself, which every man does and must empirically follow, but merely against the pretended science of the unscientific Lavater, or rather against his prophetic sentimental declarations. Zimmerman had so long and eagerly pressed Lavater upon the subject, that he at length, in the April number of the 'Museum,' undertook the defence of his own cause,—not however in Zimmerman's manner, but in his own, that is, not sweet and not sour, but an alternation and mixture of both. Lavater also subjoined something in opposition to his antagonist to the fourth volume of the 'Physiognomy,' which was printed in 1778.

This apology of Lavater, as far as Lichtenberg is concerned, rests upon a voluntary or involuntary misunderstanding; and therefore Lichtenberg, in his answer, and quite to the point, reminds the reader that Lavater might well have spared himself the three-fourths of his essay, if he had only considered that when a man finds the refutation of his adversary so very easy,

he should always ask himself if he has not fallen into the error of believing that whoever attacks any part of what a man has alleged intends to contest or even to overturn the whole.

Lichtenberg's labours were of vast importance for German culture, for promoting the freedom of the nation from servility, and from the subjection of their own judgements to that of the great world, for the independent feeling of educated men in opposition to the cry of the multitude and the clamour of the journals; this importance chiefly resulted from his satires in this case, because he showed himself, as every honourable man ought to do, to be less an opponent of Lavater's than of the vain manner and dangerous presumption by which the Zürich prophet, and the insolent and vain Hanoverian physician raised themselves to importance. Treatises and refined satire were not indeed the instruments by which a man could work upon the rigidly orthodox, the servile, or the sentimental,—they must be attacked by coarser weapons. When sophistry, official domineering, or superstition, has once gained the upper hand in a nation, no prudence will avail; the complete sansculotte system, and bold infidelity alone can stay their march; Lichtenberg therefore used the instrumentality of coarser satire, in order to make the manner, tone, and language of Lavater's followers ridiculous. On this principle we must explain his sketches of curs, pigs, and dogs' tails, and the commentaries appended to them, composed in the travestied bombast of the Lavater school.

From the rapid dissemination of the new physiognomical fanaticism, we see how important this was in a time of great mental commotion, for our nation, which is always inclined to fanaticism and exaggeration, and which has no middle point to serve for a limit or a goal. This fanaticism was by no means limited to the circle in which people were able to subscribe to the thick and splendid quarto volumes, because it was calculated to meet the cases of men who would sympathize in the bombast of the commentary for its own sake. But the Lavater fever raged also in the small Saxon duchies, in which classic learning and an interest in the general improvement and culture of the nation especially prevailed, but where also for this very reason many very shallow books were both written and read. In Weimar in particular, where, as is well known, the writings of Wieland, then Musæus, and afterwards his scholar Kotzebue, were regarded as classics, along with Göthe and Schiller, and their works were

suited to the taste of the small and petty public which thought itself great, it appeared necessary to attempt to check the rapid progress of this system. The way in which this took place may furnish any one, who will follow the course of German culture through these little capitals and their courts, with an opportunity of comparing their taste and wit with the splendid and true satire of Lichtenberg. Musæus, who as a writer was the greatest favourite in the duchy, also took the field against physiognomy, and attempted to treat this epidemic of the age in a jesting, or, as it is usually called, a humorous style : with this view Musæus wrote his 'Physiognomical Travels.' This book, as well as others by the same author, who was greatly esteemed in his time, and especially by Kotzebue, was very much sought after and read ; but it had too little internal worth, or outward significance, to lead us to mention it here further than in a merely passing way.

In despite of all these satires Lavater and Zimmerman held on their way. Their works were circulated in the whole of Germany, and they gained so high a reputation, not only at home, but in foreign lands, that every distinguished stranger who passed through Hanover, as Marcard informs us, asked after Zimmerman only, because the polite and great world, as he adds in the actual French words of such a distinguished man, thought Zimmerman the only remarkable thing in Hanover ; and he informs us that whole trains of pilgrims went to Zürich also.

Ever since the time of this controversy, the two parties in Germany have continued to stand in stronger opposition to each other than before ; because all those to whom every innovation, to whom all progress in style and in language, as well as in thought and action, were hateful, placed themselves under Lavater's banner of faith. He went hand in hand with the Jesuits, to such an extent as even to correspond with them respecting Bronner, when he fled from the monastery and came to Zürich. From that time too the enemies of the Jesuits in Berlin entered into closer union with one another, because Lavater had become in some measure the head of a sect, believed in Gassner's miracles as fully as those of the Gospel, recommended Sailer's books of devotion, entered into connexion with Stark, and promoted Jung-Stilling's fanaticisms. Any one who now reads Lavater's writings, and knows his history, will understand that within a narrow circle he might have been esteemed as a dis-

tinguished and able citizen, who loved freedom as a man and a pastor, and even as a song-writer; but every one will find it difficult to conceive how, for thirty years long, a place could have been assigned him among scholars and authors. This can only be explained by remembering that he was in some measure the head of a sect, who was blindly revered by his followers, and that his name gave importance to the insignificant and tasteless persons who advocated his cause. This cannot be better illustrated than by a reference to the person and writings of Pfenninger, whom we should certainly not have mentioned in this place, were it not with a view to show, in the case of the colleague of the Zürich parson, how far fanaticism was pushed in the very midst of all this movement in favour of enlightenment, how great homage was paid to Lavater, and to what miserable things his friends condescended.

Pfenninger was Lavater's colleague, first in the Orphan Church, then in St. Peter's, and, after the manner of the Capuchins, contended eagerly for that sensible Christianity which Lavater defended. Like the Capuchins, when they preach respecting St. Anthony, he spoke only of faith and miracles, without ever betraying by a single word that he had ever historically, critically, or even logically examined his views of Christianity, or desired to see them established. He was therefore an important man for Zürich, as Lavater was; but even there he was more fitted for a narrow circle of intimate friends than for the city, for the care of souls than valued on account of his sermons. His miserable writings nevertheless excited great attention at that period of the struggle between darkness and light, and Pfenninger, along with and on account of Lavater, was known and spoken of in every corner of Germany. It was an extraordinary kind of Christianity which these Zürich parsons and their numerous followers were anxious to set up, in opposition to the light that was bursting in in despite of all their labours and anxieties. Pfenninger and Lavater did not preach the wooden system of the catechism, as the heretic-denouncing Hamburg pastor did; on the contrary, they attached very little value to many portions of the prevailing system; they even occasionally felt and expressed strong sympathies with such men as Stattler and Sailer, who in their turn were denounced as heretics by the strict Papists.

They both preached the doctrine of the existence of a pro-

phetic gift in human souls, of a continuing power of working miracles in the midst of our world of sense, regulated by known, eternal and immutable laws, of the continuance of extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, and many similar things, which they held as firmly, and contended for with as much zeal, as for any doctrines of the Gospel whatever. The Berlin and Halle schools taught a cold system in opposition to these warm Zürich theories; there was therefore a continual warfare carried on between the two parties, and Pfenninger, who was humble amongst his own friends, and mild in domestic life, raged like a bully in defence of the opinions of his friend. In his writings, which are throughout weak, this man in other respects amiable abuses, raves against, and defames the Berlin school, Lessing, every man who would give the slightest room for the exercise of the understanding in religious things, and not leave everything to the dictates and regulation of blind feeling. In order to show how far these things were pushed, and to be able to explain the reason, not only why Lichtenberg satirized Lavater, and Lessing pitied him, but even Göthe, who looked at these things from a higher point of view, and was never bitter against persons, broke with him, we shall quote some examples of the manner in which Pfenninger conducted Lavater's cause. In one of his controversial writings against the North Germans he is not ashamed to appeal to his, *i. e.* to Lavater's, friends in these words:—"Believe when you do not see, hope where you do not believe; hope without foundation, where there is no foundation to hope." Pfenninger, as Lavater's squire, entered into a fierce controversy in defence of his knight, who had excited the surprise of the protestant public in general, by earnestly recommending Sailer's book of devotion to his distinguished and tender-hearted followers;—a book which, however admirable it may have been in itself, was strictly Catholic. In this dispute Pfenninger goes so far in his participation in Lavater's zeal, that he breaks out into this ridiculous exclamation:—"I would wager a million years of my happiness, that none of my correspondents will repent the purchase of this good book." It would probably be unjust to condemn the faith and especially the judgement of the Swiss, which in all practical and profitable things is generally sound, to condemn their kind of religiousness, and above all their taste, because Lavater and Pfenninger appeared to them to be good writers and able teachers of

religion. The fact however is undeniable, that they were the more admired and idolized in proportion as they clamoured the more bitterly, were more zealous against reason, sighed and broke out into exclamations, and the more shamefully Pfenninger reviled. How far the latter carried his polemics against the exercise of a sound human understanding, and against the representative of it, the great founder of our literature, may be best learned from Pfenninger's 'Collections for a Christian Magazine.' We cannot admit the miserable abuse of the Zürich parson into a general history; we shall therefore only subjoin a single passage of his berhymed polemics in a note. In the dog-grel given in the note, Pfenninger, and his Swiss with him, believed himself to be satirizing Lessing, and the principles maintained by him in his treatise upon the education of the human race, viz. that God in reference to his revelation follows the same law which he has followed in all the phænomena of the external world. This law is, that for finite beings, limited by time and space, every eternal rule holds good only within these limits, and that therefore every revelation is given and intended only for a definite time*.

The Swiss theologians found a powerful auxiliary in a journeyman tailor, who afterwards became a dealer in quack medicines for the eye, and at length rose to be a political economist. The manner in which Lavater made God and his Providence questions of palpable experience was much more natural to him than to the Swiss theologian. By means of Göthe, Herder, Lavater, and therefore through the aid of men of the most opposite talents and modes of thinking, Jung Stilling was raised to a degree of importance, which was founded more upon his singular destinies and upon the modes of thought and action which prevailed among a certain class of our humbler people, which were per-

* The beautiful verses of Pfenninger against a masterpiece, such as the history of the education of the human race is, run as follows :—

.....“ wenn nun voll Zuversicht
Ein Schöngeist, als aus höhern Licht,
In numerirten Sätzen spricht :
‘ Dies war der Nutzen, den es hatt’
‘ Wenn Schwächre etwas heller sehen, -
‘ (Und dies kann wahrlich bald geschehen),
‘ Mag Gotteswerk dann untergehen.
‘ Mags jeder, wie sein Decliniren
‘ Der Studiosus, fortspediren.’
So spricht er trotz dem höhern Licht
Wahrhaftig, wie.....ein Säugling spricht.”

sonified in him, and afterwards exhibited in the idyllic and sentimental style of his time, than upon any very distinguished properties of his mind. The class of men whom Jung Stilling represents, apart from all other men, is brought up and trained in Westphalia, and educated from the Bible alone, which they understand in the most literal sense. They are remarkable for that peculiar meditative character which has existed in Westphalia since the end of the fifteenth century, and still has its chief seat in the valley of the Wupper. Such a people must necessarily do homage exclusively to the views of Lavater. They have a noble and traditionary idea of the Godhead, handed down for generations among them, which the publicist and experienced man of the world, Pütter, as well as Jung Stilling the tailor, who was altogether removed from the world, imbibed from their very infancy. They find nothing singular nor strange in the fact, more than the Jews did of whom they read in the Old Testament, that the God of Christians should possess a species of bodily form and organization, that he should continue to rule in a bodily and sensible manner, and guide and lead his people almost literally by the hand. This view is much more poetical than that of the educated, who maintain the notion of the eternal and unchanging nature of a Godhead, given and to be comprehended only in idea; and in the end, to the mind of sound and thinking men, both lead to the same result. To a man like Jung Stilling, who in every step and in every action was actuated by such a principle wholly without affectation, every assistance which was rendered in a seasonable moment was regarded as coming immediately from God, and he was therefore a remarkable phenomenon in the eyes of such poets as Herder and Göthe. The manner in which he conceived life, in which he related his history and destinies, in which he understood the ways of Providence, appeared to them to be an idyll of a particular kind of natural poetry, because here nothing was made, nothing was gained by the hearers by an artificiality of form, but all sprung up as a peculiar product of an altogether singular soil. It was this which led the poets who became personally acquainted with Jung Stilling to enable him to devote his time to the preparation of a history of his life, or rather to communicate to the public his early beginnings and his views of life. He was by no means master of the language of educated men, but his style was nevertheless well suited to that description of history which

he wrote, and the first part of the history of his life is and will always continue to be the best and the most interesting among his works. Four parts of such a life were indeed too much; the first two volumes, under the title of '*Jung Stilling's Life and Wanderings*,' appeared in the years 1778 and 1779, and contain undoubtedly most remarkable materials; they form a pious sentimental idyll of a peculiar kind, of mingled truth and poetry, and of deep interest to a reader weary and worn out with the regularly turned periods and the threshed-out feelings and plots of the numerous novels, with the ridiculous leaps and bounds of the geniuses of power who were then in vogue, and of the later writers in the romantic style, and with the so-called humourists, whose distortions suggest the idea of a drunken inspiration. The mind is at least brought back to truth and nature by Jung Stilling, even although this nature is not always charming in its foul and marshy places. In spite of the miserable style of the language, which is throughout ignoble, and of the often recurring vulgar views of the noblest parts of human nature and human impulses, we wander not unwillingly by the side of this original man through different circumstances, classes of people, places and relations of life, with which those who have been brought up and educated in towns remain wholly unacquainted. The tone of cordial sincerity, the consolations which the author finds in all the singular situations of his life, through which he passes in his progress from the condition of a wandering journeyman tailor to that of the friend of the admirable Charles Frederic of Baden, or, what is the same thing, through which he is led by the hand of Providence, all this reconciles us to the holy yet cautious prudence which prevails in his conduct, and which understands how to employ Providence and all mankind as mere instruments to promote the well-being of a very humble person.

It is besides undeniable that Stilling's life and pilgrimage, especially the first two parts, made in some measure an epoch in a period of universal movement, and attracted a new and peculiar class of readers. The author's views were those of the people in all districts and provinces of Germany: the founders of the new literature were above their reach, or the literature was too worldly; but the representation of a Providence which leads every individual by the hand, and keeps his feet from falling, was so completely suited to their apprehensions and taste, that Jung Stilling in Germany, like Pfenninger in Switzerland, soon re-

ceived greater approbation and exercised more influence than his knowledge, capacities and style deserved. Jung Stilling, who, according to the history of his youth, soon became one of the corporate body of scholars as a university professor, founded a book-making trade upon his reputation, but with that we are not at present concerned. None of his later mystical, manufactured novels belong to general literature, but constitute a peculiar species in themselves, which is especially destined for the use of those whose eyes are offended and injured by the ordinary light of day, and who are glad to remain in twilight or even in total darkness. We say nothing therefore of 'Florentine von Fahlendorf,' of the 'Life of Theodore von der Linden,' of 'Theobald or the Visionary.' We must make a single remark with regard to the last-mentioned book, for the advantage of those who wish to become acquainted with and follow out the mysticism of the time, and especially of the Rosicrucians, who held Frederic William the Second quite in their toils, that he will find very useful aids and notices in this work of Stilling. He will, for example, here make acquaintance with a very considerable number of the dealers in secret knowledge, of the mystics of the age, who pursued their occupation in the Rhine countries, and learn from the credulous Jung Stilling how the history of this mysticism, so full of imposture, was handed down through the instrumentality of the Templars of the middle ages, and from Moses, Zoroaster and the Egyptian priesthood to Christian von Rosenkreuz.

§ V.

HISTORY. JOURNALISM. POLITICAL ECONOMY.

A.—HISTORY.

The universities of Germany, Leipzig in some respects and for a short time excepted, remained true to the character of learned institutions which they had at the close of the middle ages; and shortly before the reformation their teachers continued to look down from their elevation with becoming contempt upon the revolution in literature which was going on before their eyes, and prosecuted their learned money-making speculations as before. And when policy and interest prescribed

to the universities the necessity of engrafting some popular literature upon the dry stock of their learned bread-winning departments, and when this began to spring up and bear fruits in Göttingen and Jena, the members of the Grove Union, and at a later period Schiller in his correspondence, bitterly complained that no sufficient plan was given and no adequate means employed for the promotion of true human improvement and culture. It was very advantageous to our nation that, without paying great attention to the mere bread-winning system of other institutions, the governments of Hanover and Weimar pursued a different course in their universities, and in the ninth decennium of the century Göttingen became the seat of the physical and material sciences, and Jena that of the mental and æsthetic.

From the time of its foundation Göttingen had been particularly designed for the promotion of those departments of knowledge which in Hanover and London were called useful and general, or, according to the polite phrase, practical sciences; for Haller was invited to Göttingen, not as a man of taste well-versed in the belles lettres, but as an anatomist and physiologist; and had this not been so, he belonged to the Gottsched and Bodmer period, and his views or writings went very little beyond those of his models. The views with which Göttingen was founded may be best learned from an original document in the autobiography of Büsching, respecting the collective body whom the idolized Herr Von Münchausen had there brought together. A vast mass of books was a necessary appendage to this numerous band of men of solid learning, who, after the ancient fashion, did respectful homage to the court manners of the olden times, and trained the noble youth of the land to the love and practice of these manners in the stiff societies of old-fashioned conservative scholars. This necessity was amply provided for. Michaelis and Pütter were Münchausen's oracles, till Heyne at a later period displaced the former. The very names of these two men, who were both in the highest degree estimable and distinguished as scholars, and the latter also as a jurist, point out with sufficient clearness the species of culture and literature which they demanded; and they have besides expressly given us an account of their views in their biographies.

Even after Münchausen's death, Pütter continued to be the oracle of the Hanoverian government and of George the Third,

who took a personal interest in the university, and found in Pütter a man who was as sound in the faith as he was himself; but Michaelis was obliged to give way to Heyne, who had somewhat freer views, and, with greater foresight, was anxious to introduce some new light into the mere book learning of the German lecture-rooms. Pütter and Heyne could well co-operate in the promotion of the study of history and political science, of which we are now speaking, because Pütter himself was regarded as an able historian in Germany, in which people in general were acquainted with merely documentary and juridical history, which affects only the exterior of things. And this indeed he was, so far as there is no need of a soul, of a lively conception of life and of mankind, to constitute an historian; for he knew the laws, the constitution, the unholy justice of our fatherland better than any other man. Pütter was acquainted with every fact, be it ever so insignificant, in the history of the empire, and with all the sources of the thickest folios, as well as the most unimportant deduction which may have been written for a knight of the empire, and which merely related to the rights of a village, a difficult point of law, or the profitable use and occupation of a forest or a meadow. He was so much at home in all the labyrinth of German imperial and state administration, usages and claims, that his opinions were sought for even in Vienna, although he was regarded there as an opponent of imperial legislation. They requested from him the thread of Ariadne, and offered him the situation of an imperial privy-councillor. Every man wooed the sort of history which Pütter understood, taught, and whose study he prosecuted, and honoured the man who pursued it, for no other could possibly be forthcoming in the existing condition of the empire and of individual governments, and in the total want of every species of publicity.

Pütter was honoured and consulted by the princes, counts of the empire and barons, by states and cities, more than any of the great spirits of the age (Göthe alone, who was a minister, being excepted); and the two thick volumes of his autobiography were especially intended to establish this fact by documentary evidence. Pütter's History of the Empire was therefore regarded as the model of history by the only readers which Germany then afforded for this department of learning. These consisted partly of the nobles, who read nothing but French books, and partly of jurists. The youth, who were the hopes of Germany,

regularly assembled half-yearly in Pütter's auditorium, in order to collect his historico-juridical wisdom, which was inaccessible to all others from the cuirass of learning by which it was defended. This may be seen from his accurate announcement of the names of his auditors, in which the *fili nobiles* are distinguished according to their rank and dignity; to them also a particular place was allotted. Then, as he triumphantly informs us, with respect to the national intelligence which he diffused, there were princes and counts of the empire, their noble companions and highly distinguished tutors, there were barons and knights of the empire, there were the patrician sons of our cities and of those of Switzerland. The remainder were only reckoned by the head, and not named,—“*numerus et sine nomine vulgus.*” All those therefore who took any interest in history, and did not belong to those of whom Pütter, in common with Homer, judged that “they were neither worthy of being reckoned in the field nor in council,” wished to found their own fortune or that of those in whose service they became distinguished and rich, upon the feudal rights of the middle ages, or to deduce from the German law and history what they might turn to their own advantage. As history was only cultivated in Göttingen in a manner completely feudal, and as the custom was to spend the working days among books, deductions and nobility, and on Sunday to pay visits dressed in silk stockings, all who wished to breathe a freer atmosphere took refuge in philosophy, which was not to be found in Göttingen, or from statute-law flew for succour and interest to the laws of reason. This attracted the plebeians and all those of a freer spirit to Darjes in Frankfort on the Oder, and then to Jena, where one philosophical revelation after another was promulgated from the year 1787 by Reinhold, Fichte and Schelling, and all of them announced with such confidence that students flocked thither by hundreds.

In connexion with Pütter we must mention his countryman Achenwall, who was related to him in mind, and who in like manner, as a professor of law, combined history and political science, but in the former acknowledged rather a profitable and useful than an elevating and philosophical science. For the benefit of the same class of persons whom Pütter had collected around him, he taught the knowledge of what was real, practical and useful, and his discovery of statistics was not so much calculated to enlarge the circle of their ideas as their knowledge

of facts. They were taught by the instrumentality of memory alone, and not to judge of the concerns of life like men engaged in its affairs. His wisdom, like that of the other Göttingen professors, was founded on and entrusted to compendiums. Büsching was only a fleeting appearance in Göttingen, who wrote his geography and other historical and geographical works with commendable industry, and with all the minute correctness of the preceding age, but also so completely in its style and taste that we cannot speak of him in this history. Gatterer's services rendered to the advancement of general German culture were limited to his geographical labours; all his other writings, whose value we do not here purpose to weigh, belonged to the first part of the century, and so also did their manner of considering and treating history. Gatterer treated geography with intelligence and taste; and not only facilitated its study, but accommodated it admirably to the necessities of life, and even to the sermonized principles of the originators of the new education. His merits in this respect, as well as in relation to the maps which were exhibited by him to his hearers, but which never came, properly speaking, into the book-trade, have not been sufficiently appreciated.

Schlözer was a pupil of Michaelis and Achenwall, and little therefore can be said of his classical culture; still he made an exception in Germany, and excited great attention, because he pursued the study of statistics, the law of nations and political economy, in no careless or loose manner, although he was often surprising and extravagant, and more disposed towards the Russian autocracy than to the prevailing aristocracy of Germany. The manner in which he pursued and treated universal history, in opposition to Herder's plans and views, whom he used very ill, has something of the character of genius about it, although he went almost as far in his prosaic insolence as Herder had done in his poetical contempt. His chief merit, however, as a promoter of German progress towards a life free from slavish servility, rests upon his having made himself, by means of his journal, as we shall afterwards show, a terror to all the little despots, mystifying and protocolling officials of the little governments of the land. As an inquirer he was great and profitable; but we cannot here discuss his primitive history of the north, to which he devoted a quarto volume, his works published in Sweden and Russia upon Russian, Swedish and Turkish history,

which he has treated with learning, because our remarks must be confined to works of an improving character which produced effects upon the people, and not merely upon the learned. All these histories, which entitled Schlözer to a place in the imperial or royal academies, and perhaps also to an order, were written in the style and taste of Mascov and Gebauer, who were his immediate predecessors; but their merits in other respects were so great, that they can well afford to be without the praise of philosophy or taste.

Schlözer was a nominal professor in Göttingen as early as 1764; but he remained in Russia some time after his appointment, and became a teacher in the university in 1769. As he would not interfere with Achenwall, and his lectures upon the history of North and South Europe could prove attractive to the learned alone, he sought to create for himself an entirely new university science, viz. universal history. In this way Schlözer earlier adopted the idea of an ill-digested philosophy of the history of mankind than Herder did a poetical one. He delivered lectures upon what, according to his fashion of considering the universe, he called 'Universal History,' and wrote a small work upon the subject, in which ingenious thought and clever views alternate with the rudest and coarsest authoritative presumption. Schlözer's lectures and his little work, which he first published, 1772-1775, under the title of 'A View of Universal History,' and in the third edition, 1785 and 1789, with the title, 'The History of the World, according to its main divisions, in their extent and connexion,' belong to the period in which Herder called so much attention to himself by the novelty of his ideas. Both might have been very profitable to the nation without interfering with each other; a controversy between them appeared impossible, because the one viewed history from the clouds and the other from the Göttingen point of view. They however engaged in a frightful quarrel, because neither could bear the slightest contradiction.

Both were obviously too hasty in their dispositions, too much enamoured of themselves, and encouraged in their vanity by the abundant incense which was offered them by their numerous friends and adherents, properly to estimate with quietness and strict impartiality the very various systems and views of naturalists and historians about the earth and its inhabitants, or the relative value of different systems of religion, national peculiari-

ties and literature, and to draw a picture of all times and nations satisfactory to such as were educated upon principles different from both the universal historians. Herder had neither made great acquirements in the study of nature, nor had he long and patiently studied astronomy and geognosy and their auxiliary sciences, nor did he possess mature, solid and well-digested historical learning. He therefore wrote his history of the world in the same manner as he would have written an epic poem. In the inspiration of the moment, he regards neither the logical connexion of his allegations, nor is he distinguished for memory or criticism: Schlözer, on the contrary, is as full of passion and vehemence as a universal historian as he always really was in life. He is altogether lost in what is outward; he acknowledges only outward appearances and sensible greatness, but no intellectual or contemplative qualities. He scarcely allows fancy, feeling, true greatness of soul, and all that is connected with it, to be regarded as essential qualities of man. We are tempted to laugh when, with a comical vehemence, as we have sometimes heard him do in his lectures (1796), he defends the rights and advantages of outward life, of which defenders are not wanting even among savages, in opposition to spiritual and intellectual claims. In his views therefore the world of Grecian antiquity was far behind the modern world; the intellectual greatness of the Greeks, with all the poetical qualities and graces of its heroes, disappear from his eyes in comparison with the innumerable multitudes of Mongols and Tartars, and Miltiades was to him only a village-bailiff compared with the leaders of barbarous hordes and the hundred thousands who fought under a Zingiskhan and a Tamerlane. Schlözer never remarks the colossal, moral greatness of freedom of opinion and of expression, which was concentrated in the small states of the Greeks, because his eye was accustomed to dwell on the manifestation of the great physical extension of the immense despotic kingdoms of Asia. In this, however, it must be admitted, that although he went too far, he paved the way which alone can lead to that species of history which the necessities of our time require. He applied the principles of Voltaire and Bolingbroke to our learned history; but with their criticism he united that learned investigation, solid knowledge of particulars and accessory materials of history, in which both were totally deficient. He first withdrew ancient history from the tyrannical dominion of theolo-

gians, because he had been educated in a profound knowledge of languages and exegesis by Michaelis, and taught to treat the history of the Jews like that of any other nation.

Schlözer was indeed not altogether unbiassed ; he showed this by his polemical writings during the troubles in Holland, by his controversial paper in favour of Lewis Ernest of Brunswick, as well as by his vehemence in support of George the Third and the English aristocracy against the North Americans ; but his feeling of justice and right made him in other cases and in general the defender of natural rights and of a sound understanding against feudal claims, obsolete parchment rights, and traditionary erroneous but generally reigning opinions. Schlözer's Lectures upon newspapers and politics, which indeed afterwards assumed a somewhat strong conservative direction, and especially from being delivered in Göttingen, as it then was, are peculiar in their kind, because he heard of or found out every violation of right and every act of tyranny, and assailed them with the vehemence peculiar to him. What the newspapers did not write, what even his own journal dare not admit, he announced to a numerous circle of hearers, all of whom disappeared after the time of the revolution. We perceive the spirit of the age, especially in that kind of influence which Schlözer had, placed as he was beside Pütter, Meiners, and such men in Göttingen ; this spirit was exhibited in the combined efforts of all classes, conditions and confessions to wrestle out for themselves freedom of mind and free institutions, to break in pieces the chains of the middle ages, of feudality, and of the seventeenth century. This is the more remarkable in the case of Schlözer, because, in the first fifteen years of his office as a teacher, he was attended by a vast concourse of hearers, and spoke with that free courage, strength and vehemence which were peculiar to him, in presence of those who would now turn away from him with abhorrence, if he ventured publicly to speak in the same tone, which would scarcely perhaps be the case.

Spittler shone in Göttingen from 1780—1795. He possessed a remarkably easy, fluent, extemporaneous delivery, which the author of this work admired the more as his style and manner of address were peculiar to himself. Spittler began his career as a learned inquirer, and ended it as the minister of the most violent despot in Germany ; the middle portion of his life alone falls properly within the scope of our history. His investiga-

tions in church history and canon law first recommended him as a scholar, and as a fearful enemy of all the frauds, falsehoods and forgeries, by means of which the domineering and ambitious ecclesiastics of the middle ages had reduced mankind under their dominion; and he was known also as an ecclesiastical historian. He soon, however, turned his attention to political history. His first learned dissertation proved to scholars, for whom alone it was intended, the absolute nullity of the claims of the Popish church and of the Byzantine ecclesiastical faith. His manual of ecclesiastical history, as well as his later works, was intended for the educated part of the public, which strove again to recover their former legal rights in spiritual as well as in temporal things. The manual of ecclesiastical history, in a very brief and popular manner, announced the result of his inquiries about what Schlözer was accustomed to call the Hildebrandism of the middle ages. In other words, Spittler contended not merely against popery, but against the power of the priesthood in general, and therefore against the fanaticism of the Protestant clergy, who strove to compel their hearers to believe in the symbolical books instead of those of the Bible. Spittler, in a comprehensible and tasteful manner, exhibited to the public in all their nakedness the arts and inventions of priests of every kind.

In political history Spittler began precisely where Schlözer had left off, and followed the progressive advancement of his age. Schlözer would not admit of an unconditional necessity for freedom as belonging to human nature, but referred everything to physical comforts and material well-being. According to his manner of considering society, in which he referred everything to good administration, to order, police and law, by whomsoever instituted and maintained, he was able, with a good conscience, to praise Peter the Great, Lewis Ernest of Brunswick, and Lord North's ministry, and was not inconsistent in bitterly abusing Franklin, the Dutch patriots and Lafayette. That, Spittler could not do. Schlözer bestowed far more care and attention upon the millions of Chinese, upon the numerous hordes of Mongols, Turks and Tartars, upon the rude power of the Russians, Lithuanians and Cumanians, than upon the restless Greeks, who were enemies to all police, to intrigues and constraints, or upon the North Americans, who, according to his opinion, were scandalous rebels, and whom he both despised and hated. Spittler, on the contrary, through his whole history referred to the necessity of

freer and constitutional governments. His particular histories of the German principalities showed Spittler, in all his tendencies, to be, on the one hand, a man of the people, who in the sense of Joseph and Frederic, and many other noble princes of the age, was desirous of making the people of some importance in the state; and on the other hand, to be a diplomatist and courtier, such as his external appearance presented him in Göttingen, *i. e.* he showed himself to be a man who had a ministerial office already in his eye. In order to have nothing to renounce, it was his universal practice to proceed only to that point, at which he must either have been obliged to say what he did not wish to say, or to give a false account. His history may therefore be regarded, without exception, as written in the spirit of European humanity striving after freedom, because when he ceased to be a free man, he also ceased to be a writer.

His history of Wirtemberg, as well as that of Brunswick-Luneburg, is only carried on to the point of time in which he himself lived, in which therefore a man such as he was could have written history, which would have been immediately profitable in life, because the writer is at the same time its record, source and author, inasmuch as he writes what he has seen. What he has written, however, is written in the spirit of his age; he shows by facts the course which the inhabitants of the various countries of the empire must begin to follow, in order to be worthy of their forefathers, and after their example to struggle boldly against the princely and aristocratical pretensions of the higher ranks and in favour of the unutterably important rights and privileges of the people, to set limits at the same time to the military-juridical inroads of the princes and their herd of officials, and to the privileged oligarchy of the states. Spittler, without declamation or demonstration, shows with what firmness and perseverance the German burgers defended their rights even in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of which they were afterwards robbed by military power, by princes who followed the example of Lewis and the Prussian kings, when their servile souls began to woo court favours, and they themselves, egoistically involved in and devoted to their private gain, forgot and forsook the common cause.

In the composition of his manual of European history he follows the same plan and the same prudence which was recommended by Napoleon. He does not touch upon the most recent

times (*d'éviter la proximité des tems*), he left that to his continuator Sartorius, who is readily distinguished from Spittler without the fact being indicated in the work, for he, alas! was only like Spittler in one quality, his vanity. He everywhere points out prominently the advance and the retrogradation of the striving after political freedom with a sure tact—those states in which the administration was favourable to the people and those in which it was not. He follows this view also in the journal which he undertook, in connexion with a man like Meiners, who might be denounced as an enemy to all freedom and to the best interests of humanity, if he were not too contemptible as a mere book-maker. Every leaf of Spittler's manual proves his correct views and instantaneous comprehension of the important subjects which belong to every single period,—a faculty in which the most learned are often greatly deficient. One perceives with astonishment in what manner a man of great and clear understanding, with natural tact in judging of sources and documents, by merely turning over the leaves with an experienced eye, in an instant finds that which the mere man of learning has sought after for years with vain though assiduous study. It is not easy therefore to comprehend, when Spittler had given up the manual and history, how Sartorius could venture, in one and the same text, to press so close upon him, that no one knows by outward sign where Spittler ceases and his shadow begins; but those who are judges of the matter readily perceive the difference, and that with feelings either of laughter or contempt.

It was a great loss for German historical writing, that at the very time when Spittler, by means of his manual, had made the nature of history, by his noble language, his tone, tact, brevity and compactness, accessible to all Germans, and called the learned into the light of life from rooting among sources and documents, and from the obscurity of folios and quartos, that Dohm should have withdrawn himself from history and entered upon practical life, only to return to his studies and his writing in his old-age. An honest man like Dohm, filled with the spirit of the finest period of Germany, full of love for freedom and his country, and as well acquainted with affairs of state as with books, if he had earlier devoted his attention to the subject, would have been able to have given an importance altogether different from that which they possess or ever will attain, to his memoirs, which stand almost isolated in our history. We mention these memoirs

here, or rather his history of the states of Prussia, Austria and Russia till the death of Frederic the Second, which first appeared in the present century, because the work in its spirit and contents belongs to the period of which we are now treating. His history is not drawn from books, but from his own immediate experience. It goes hand in hand with information upon politics and political economy, and is by no means made subordinate to them after the fashion of the Doctrinaires. The work being intended chiefly for inquirers and educated men of business, who cannot be deceived by mere rhetoric like the mass of ordinary readers, the narrative is natural, like the style, and wholly free from sophistry. Dohm naturally views his subject from the standing-point of a liberal German statesman and man of business, for this was his position, and affects no peculiar genius or philosophy; this very circumstance gives his work a pre-eminent value among the hundreds of compilations which exist, and which affect all sorts of originality and genius, in both of which they are utterly deficient. Dohm's book, as is well known, is the only one of the kind which a German statesman has written in a simple and clear manner upon public events, without other views than those of an honourable man. Dohm shows himself to be an admirer of Frederic the Second, and with good reason; but there is no trace to be found of a silly idolizing, or of a blind approval of all that Frederic thought and did, for he shone resplendent among those who sought to gain for their contemporaries and their posterity freedom of mind and a freer civil constitution.

Dohm's whole course of life, and his political and historical writings, prove him to have been the only man who combined in himself the learning of the old method of education, and the capacities of an able man of business, with that eager zeal which would have enabled him thoroughly to reform the dead German life, benumbed by indifference, pedantry and learning. As a young man, he entered into Basedow's views of accommodating the education of youth to the necessities of the age; he pursued this idea for some time with great zeal, and continued with Basedow in Dessau till he perceived that persons like Basedow and Wolke were only fit to devise utopian plans, or that, if they were able to project those of a different description, they were not in a condition to carry them into execution. Immediately afterwards he assailed the physiocratic system of politics with overwhelming arguments, to the great grief of F. H.

Jacobi, with whom and with multitudes of others this favoured system was then the fashion, because, as the announcer of the doctrines of a new life and of a new history, he found in their views a support of the old. He was a transient luminary in the institution in Cassel, which the Landgrave, or more properly speaking Herr von Schlieffen, wished to found in opposition to the universities of the middle ages, whose chief departments and studies bore merely upon the means of subsistence. The mongrel institution in Cassel soon fell to pieces, or, as we have already remarked in another place, so few scholars entered its walls that it necessarily failed, like a similar one under the Prince Primate at Frankfort on the Main, in which the author of this history held a situation for two years.

In the year 1779, Dohm was called from Cassel to Berlin, and there entered upon his diplomatic career. At the same time a house of refuge was opened for George Forster, in the Carolinum at Cassel. Forster was a noble man and an ardent lover of freedom, in short one of the most distinguished men in Germany; and the Swiss Johannes Müller undertook the historical department in Cassel with immense claims and pretensions. Müller was a man who was continually striving after something else than that for which nature had intended him; he was shortly after called to Mainz in order to serve the Elector with his pen; he therefore turned his attention from teaching to writing, and in Mainz he again met with Sömmering and Forster, who in the meantime had been in Wilna. Müller shortly afterwards in his new situation laid the foundation of that sort of fortune which he had long sought after, by defending the hierarchy and the feudal aristocracy; whilst Forster, in consequence of his beautiful dreams of freedom and human rights, was shamefully neglected and forsaken.

It was about this time that Müller brought into notice an entirely new and peculiar kind of historiography in Germany, which every body afterwards eulogized as the highest. He wrote a work which indeed only few understood, and which could only be partially enjoyed, in which an immense erudition and a mass of citations are, for the most part, superfluously wasted, but which nevertheless was regarded as a perfect masterpiece. Müller's work was universally acknowledged as a model of German history, and at the end of the preceding century, as in our own, it has been imitated even to the highest pitch of

absurdity, precisely in its greatest defects. We may dispose of it very briefly, because a criticism would now come too late and does not fall within the scope of our purpose. The Germans rewarded Müller with reputation, with honour, with orders, with money, for a work in which the Swiss are represented as desiring not to be regarded as Germans, and are very ingeniously placed on a footing with the ancient Greeks, and the same man who trumpeted the praises of freedom and its heroes, of Tell, Arnold von Winkelried and the rest, was a courtier of the Prince Bishop of Mainz; as a Protestant, the apologist of Pius the Sixth, the protégé of the house of Hapsburg in Vienna when freedom was persecuted; a servant of the military monarchy in Berlin, and finally even of Jerome Buonaparte in Cassel.

As no one took offence at all this, we see how far Müller had outrun his age, and how in the preceding century he composed a purely scientific work of art of a wholly objective nature, to which not the smallest portion of subjectivity attaches either in its contents or language. We shall only therefore, in passing, make one or two remarks with respect to the outward influence of the work. For the purpose of his Swiss history, Müller in a singular manner formed for himself an entirely peculiar style, which was wholly different from what he elsewhere used. It is as artificial and wearisome as Jacobi's, but of another description. Jacobi accommodated his academic style to his academic modern philosophy, in the same way as Müller accommodated his imitation of ancient style to his romantic imitative history. By means of his numerous friends and acquaintances, who were among the most important and influential men of the state, and among the learned, Müller's 'History of Switzerland' at first obtained the same renown which, in the same way, Klopstock's 'Messiah' had previously obtained as an epic poem. He won the favour of the learned by means of his great learning, and even by a luxurious indulgence in authorities and citations of a number of references for things, which would have been believed and could be proved without any authorities, but especially by having placed the institutions, customs, laws, and aristocracy of the middle ages in a new and very splendid light. The fewer persons there were who read the whole work, and the more eloquent and splendid the single portions were, which were read by very many, the more rejoicing there was, that all had been more splendid in the feudal ages than its admirers had

even ventured to hope ; and because this could be documentarily proved from chronicles and records, so much the greater became Müller's reputation. He has been very harshly attacked on his own ground as an historical artist by Woltmann, whom he had helped to bring forward from obscurity, and who in fact is in all respects his inferior. We do not enter upon their question, because we do not understand it, but leave our readers to inquire of Woltmann about the kind of historical art which Müller by his example and Woltmann by his criticism recommended. We have now nothing to do with the theory of history, but with the influence of its writers and the effects which they produced in and upon their age. In this respect Müller and the singular concurrence of the learned, who sometimes foolishly eulogized him as the Thucydides and sometimes as the Tacitus of the Germans, were doubly injurious, because the renown which he enjoyed among the polite and the learned contributed to lead astray a new generation of writers, as the romantic school had previously done, and then the re-action in opposition to the false enlightenment of the eighteenth century brought his manner and even his language into fashion.

From the case of Müller we may best learn what things extend the reputation of the learned, and form the foundation of the influence of their books. He owed his reputation among the great public, in the first quarter of our century, (in which we have met with very few among those with whom we have spoken respecting Müller, who had read even single portions of his Swiss history with any attention) precisely to those works which he himself, and with the best reason, regarded as not worth printing ; namely, his work on universal history, for we would rather not mention his *Travels of the Popes*, and his *History of the Alliance of the Princes*. As to his general history, it is obvious at first sight, that the ancient portion of it consists of lectures calculated for effect, for young gentlemen of rank, in which unquestionably much that is very able and ingenious is related in a splendid manner, but which Woltmann or such a man as he could have written quite as well, and could have stated much better than Müller with his repulsive dialect ; these very lectures have been the sources of Müller's reputation in our own century. We cannot, however, enter further upon this general history, nor upon Müller's later historical industry and influence, as both belong to the nineteenth and not to the eighteenth century.

B.—RELATION OF WRITERS TO GOVERNMENTS. JOURNALISM.
POLITICAL ECONOMY.

In the first quarter of the eighteenth century there did not exist in Germany even the shadow of political freedom, of open verbal discussion or freedom of the press. These now glimmer feebly here and there; public expression of opinion about passing events would have been altogether impossible, had it not been for a zeal which existed in the minds of many of the princes, and of the best ministers of that time, for the enlightenment of the people and the abolition of abuses. Since the time of Napoleon this zeal has altogether disappeared. Political newspapers may be said to have had no existence; for what could they report in a land, where they were only endured under the strictest supervision and the keenest censors,—in a land in which the administration of justice was not public, in which the citizens understood neither the writings of their advocates nor the decisions of their judges, because both were composed in half Latin half jargon, and in which the decree comprehended in a single sentence, was for form's sake spread out over two or three breathless pages? in a land, in which even the transactions of the feudal assemblies were kept in official and dignified silence and secrecy, who would venture even by a word of truth to excite the anger of the petty imperial counts or high barons who held sovereign sway in the villages and the plains; or of one of the noble or even middle-class burgomasters, who ruled by an arbitrary police and perverted justice in the towns? Such newspapers could only have secured an existence and a footing amongst us by the favour of these governments, which were anxious to introduce a literature similar to that which they admired among the French. Journalism therefore first passed over to politics from belles lettres, although Wieland sometimes let fall a free expression in his 'Mercury.' Besides, that period was particularly distinguished by this, that the most respected and most honoured men made the attempt to let themselves down to this light species of writing, in our country, in which properly speaking no capital gives the tone and leads the taste,—in which a bookseller, a university, a journal cleverly got up, a small capital situated in some corner, a speculator or a combination of speculators, can readily make themselves masters of

the dictatorship of literature. As we purpose to illustrate the influence of journalism by some examples, we must cast a hasty glance upon the participation which some of the princes and ministers took in the anxious struggles of the learned to secure enlightenment and greater freedom of the press.

The 'Universal German Library,' which was a monthly journal, as long as Frederic lived, was an offence to all the favourers of dogmatism and obscurity, and his minister Zedlitz gave Bahrdt a refuge and Eberhardt a professorship in Halle. In the smaller German cities, the free cities excepted, every proposal for public improvement was favoured merely on account of the opinions of the Emperor and the King of Prussia; we ought to add, in Baden and Dessau also from a nobler motive. The Duke of Brunswick protected Lessing, and afterwards Mauvillon, against the fanatical outcry of theological and political persecutors. This protection he continued to extend as long as circumstances permitted, and no man but an enthusiast can or ought to expect more from princes and diplomatists. In Weimar, the dowager Duchess Anna Amalia, who was by birth a princess of Brunswick, and afterwards the young Duke, brought together a number of men, who, in the midst of the dull ephemeral literature and of the witticisms of Musäus and Kotzebue, which were favoured by the court nobility, founded a literature of a more solid description and of higher pretensions. Göthe, Herder and Schiller were obliged indeed often to do homage to the court taste of the honourable and right-honourable lords and ladies to whom Wieland's writings were completely suited; but all the four became more useful than they would otherwise have been, by uniting all classes in favour of the new literature, and enabling the public wholly to dispense with the French wares by the introduction of something better.

In the time of the seven years' war, the Duchess of Gotha, with a view to the education of her son, on the one hand invited Pütter to come to her court in order to instruct the future regent in the history of the empire and the nature of its constitution and laws, and on the other hand invited Voltaire, who knew nothing whatever of German history, to prepare a work upon the subject; the last-mentioned circumstance, however, proves that she wished to contribute to put an end to the old and useless pursuits of learned inquirers. Grimm's correspondence also

with the future Duke, the trifles which the latter caused Grimm to write to him from Paris, as well as the Duke of Brunswick's compliments lavished upon Marmontel, and Mirabeau's reception in Brunswick, all go to prove that the governors shared in the zeal of the nation to break loose from the old bonds, and favoured its progress. We have already pointed out the manner in which Duke Charles of Wirtemberg in a military fashion wished to promote the progress of the new methods of culture, of which he really felt the necessity, whilst Von Schlieffen prevailed upon the Margrave of Hesse Cassel to be active in the promotion of the same objects, without having the least taste for the subject himself or being at all sensible of its importance. The noble Fürstenberg, as a minister in dark Münster, was a zealous friend of knowledge, and took those scholars who were struggling against the darkness of the age under his special protection. F. H. Jacobi, and even the somewhat too genial and cynical Heinse, who although a Protestant became librarian to the Primate of the German Catholic clergy, were amongst the number of his intimate friends. As we learn from the journals of the times, and as may be proved especially from Schlözer's notices of political affairs, Fürstenberg sought to found a new order of things both in temporal and spiritual affairs, in Westphalia, which had remained in all respects far behind the spirit of the age. Jesuits, nobles and mistresses were quite as powerful with Charles Theodore, as Elector, when he ruled over the beautiful Rhine-land alone, the Palatinate and Berg, as they afterwards were when he inherited Bavaria also. But he had then very different councillors, both in Mannheim and Düsseldorf, from those which he afterwards had in Munich. His minister, Von Hompesch, and others like him in the Lower Rhine, wished not only to keep pace with the spirit of the age, but Hompesch, when he had permission so to do, in many respects outran it, especially in questions of finance and administration. F. H. Jacobi was employed for some time under Hompesch, with a view to carry out physiocratic ideas. Music, the theatre and the fine arts were promoted in such a manner in Mannheim, as at least to show a good-will to encourage German dramatic poetry instead of French, and in operas to substitute rational and intelligible German words for Italian trills and quavers. Wieland, as is well known, was summoned to aid that purpose, but we must not venture to allege that he adopted the right course,—to pro-

mote the German opera by travestyng Euripides—since Göthe, even as a youth, somewhat insolently denied this. The mere institution of an academy, *i. e.* a union of vain men, for the purpose of making speeches and writing dissertations, we should rather have called a retrograde movement to the manner of Louis the Fourteenth and of other princes who aped the emperor Augustus and the Medici, than an advance, if this academy had not rendered great services to the German language and history,—services, as appears from their writings, not merely to the learned alone, but to the educated classes in general. It was still a glory and an advance, that, whilst controversial preachers raved in Heidelberg and in Düsseldorf, both Wieland's German operas were brought out with great cost and magnificence in Mannheim. Iffland dramatized and represented the new kind of thinking and feeling, and afterwards Schiller also was acknowledged as a great genius, although at first he appeared as one of the geniuses of power, and his earliest productions were somewhat dissolute and redundant.

Von Breidbach, as governor of Erfurt, which at that time belonged to the Elector of Mainz, had already attempted to make a splendid out of an obscure university, and a palace which had been the residence of the lazy and ignorant champions of old abuses, a refuge for the defenders of the new light. We have already remarked that he was able to retain Wieland there only for a very short time, and that Bahrdt, Riedel, and such men, were not calculated to recommend the new light. This new light was however afterwards cherished and powerfully promoted in the Electorate of Mainz. Both the Electors who reigned in Mainz before Charles von Dalberg, however unlike they may have been in life and conversation, equally sought to share in the renown of aiding and protecting the prevailing spirit, which longed and laboured for improvement. The suffragan bishop had his seat in Erfurt, and although his fancy, as well as his disposition, which was inclined to kindness, was perhaps a little too easily excited,—although his understanding now and then was too easily led astray,—he had a lively sense for everything great and good. Charles von Dalberg, as coadjutor in Erfurt, was held in great respect among the Germans, as he was at a later period in the time of Napoleon, in which it was thought, with good reason, that his admiration of Napoleon's greatness of mind went somewhat too far. In Erfurt he had the reputa-

tion of being the Mæcenas and Musagetes of the Germans, was idolized as a noble and liberal-minded man, and attached himself to the party of the *illuminati*, who wished to bring back the Catholic religion to its original purity: even his failures and weakness had nothing common or vulgar in them, but flowed from the same source with his virtues. Among the last three Electors, who all laboured with zeal to banish the spirit of the middle ages from their states and to bring in a newer and a more living spirit, the first, Emmerich Joseph, was in all respects the most estimable and the most worthy. At the same time in which Basedow undertook to reform the previous modes of education and books of instruction among the Protestants, and when the abbot Felbinger had essentially improved the schools for the people in Austria, Emmerich Joseph also on his part showed the liveliest and noblest zeal to set bounds to the Jesuits and to their mechanical religious exercises, and by a better system of instruction to remove and banish their offensive service of images and ceremonies. His successor, Charles Frederic Joseph (von Erthal), was anxious to raise the old university of Erfurt to new splendour, and for that purpose brought together a number of celebrated professors, some of whom were Protestants, and selected Johannes Müller, first as his librarian, and afterwards as his private secretary. In moral and political relations he was far inferior to his predecessor, but he laboured for the enlightenment of his generation as he had done. He proved this by the exertions which he made to set bounds to the pretensions of the Roman curia, by means of the points agreed upon and established together with the other archbishops in Ems.

The last Elector but one in Cologne, by founding the new university in Bonn, had given a proof of his participation in the newly awakened spirit of Germany, striving after knowledge and improvement; and his successor sought to advance the interests of the new university, and at least a ray of light seemed to force its way into the continuing darkness of the church of Cologne. The outcry against knowledge and enlightenment was, alas! afterwards increased, and a new pretence was given to the enemies of all light to cleave fast to the old ways, as alone affording a safe guide, by George Forster in Mainz, and Eulogius Schneider in Bonn, passing over from the Germans to the French. George Forster was deceived, as all of us were deceived, by our youthful dreams, among whom the ideas of the rights of men and of the

oppression of social relations among certain classes and ranks had become lively. During the reign of terror in Alsace, Eulogius Schneider proved that he had passed over from the fanaticism of Torquemada to that of Robespierre and Fouquier Tainville. The Archbishop of Treves was distinguished by his tolerance towards the Protestants, who were persecuted by almost all the Catholic governments besides. The Prince Bishop Francis Lewis of Bamberg and Würzburg protected the enlightened monks against their tyrannical or fanatical abbots, as is shown by the example of Schade.

The men who sought in those times to work upon the great public by means of journals which could be circulated from hand to hand, and were better calculated for the moment and for producing a quick but transitory impression than books, reckoned upon the aid and protection of the government, and of those classes and conditions of men who are now in Germany the most determined and zealous antagonists of all freedom, whether in thinking, acting, or speaking. We have already mentioned the 'Universal German Library,' the 'German Mercury,' and the 'Göttingen Notices,' and we shall further refer to the 'Berlin Monthly Journal' only for one reason, because its editors or contributors were accused of having carried on their war against the Jesuits in such a manner as to have made themselves often ridiculous, and to have been obnoxious to the same reproach of decrying others as heretics, as those were whom they made their opponents. It was still however a struggle of opinions, which they excited, although it had become a personal strife, and there was no educated man in Germany who did not take a part either for or against the Jesuit-smellers, as they were called. The accusations which were brought against Gedike, Biester and Nicolai were however ill-founded, viz. that they raised a completely unfounded outcry, changed the dreams of their fancy into real manifestations, and saw ghosts everywhere in their path. The experience of the present day teaches us that these were no mere conceits of fancy, that the dreams of the night walk about and around us in the clear day, that the ghosts have become clothed with flesh and bones, and gained a fearful and dangerous power. Nicolai ruled the 'Universal German Library' with such unlimited sway, that we shall not speak at any length of its direction, and no proper definite tendency can be assigned to the 'Göttingen Notices,' partly because Heyne presided over the work in the

spirit of a diplomatist, and partly because the whole of the Göttingen professors were contributors. The way in which the most miserable compilers among them are mixed up with the ablest men, and with their works, which are written with fire, soul and sense, may be best seen from Meiners' miserable notice of George Forster's '*Voyage round the World*,' which is a work of the highest genius. Conviction will be brought to every mind that presumptuous and narrow-minded pedants were at that time as powerful in Germany as insolent and domineering priests, although we cannot but be astonished that such a thing should be sent into the world under the name of a Royal Society of Science. So it is, however, with these so-called academies!

As to Wieland's '*Mercury*,' we cannot reckon it amongst the number of those reforming journals which worked upon life, the state and literature, in this progressive age, and of which we exclusively treat. Wieland himself openly informs us of the species of speculation which he had in his eye, in the case of the '*Mercury*.' Having a careful and anxious regard to the feelings and wishes of the Weimar courtiers, and the officials of other small courts, he wrote to Jacobi, who played the character of a polite and distinguished man, and therefore avoided the proximity of other distinguished characters, in a style which completely discloses his position and views. When Jacobi sent him the conclusion of '*Allwill's Letters*' for insertion in the '*Mercury*' of 1776, he replied to him as follows:—"I will, with your permission, omit some of the severest passages about the service of great gentlemen in your last Allwill's papers. God knows how you, with your consciousness of your situation and mine, should write such things and send them to me in order that I should cause them to be printed." Hence appears not only the total want of moral courage among these polygraphs, but it is plain also, that no free and bold expression of opinion, no kind of censure of the existing nature of things, was to be hoped for or expected from these periodicals.

Schlözer carried out what no other man in Germany could have done, and that too in Hanover, and in spite of the alarm which was raised against him from all quarters. He erected a tribunal, before whose claims and decisions all the friends of darkness in Germany, all the numerous little tyrants, their despotic officials and bumbailiffs became pale with fear, at least those among them who had still so much feeling of shame or

responsibility left, as to be capable either of blushing or becoming pale. Schlözer was admirably fitted to undertake a periodical upon administrations, governments, and history, in such times as his were, in consequence of his extensive acquaintances in all countries, of his faults, as well as of his good qualities and various knowledge. As he had German states and governments chiefly in his eye, it is clear that Schlözer's courage and his iron feelings were necessary to enable him as a Göttingen professor, even to think of a political journal, when we consider the feelings of anxiety with which Wieland was obliged to weigh and measure every little word in a journal of taste. The moment which Schlözer chose was certainly fortunate and favourable. The internal divisions in England and the North American war had roused up the minds of men who were striving for deliverance from bondage, in a way very different from that which persons were accustomed to read of in German journals, and those journals were too far behind the condition at which they have now arrived, in spite of their still existing imperfections.

Schlözer conducted his undertaking with great prudence, so as to make a beginning, to introduce some degree of publicity into Germany, and to furnish the oppressed with an opportunity of giving utterance to their complaints. He undertook his journal with the apparent view of promoting the orthodox science of statistics, which had been lately brought into notice by his teacher Achenwall. He published, at first in flying sheets, a variety of reports chiefly upon statistics, which were sent to him from various places, under the title of 'Correspondence'; a year after this commencement (1776), his papers properly assumed the form of a journal, with the title of 'New Correspondence.' This journal was to appear regularly in numbers, six in a year. There existed indeed at that time another politico-statistical journal, 'Büsching's Magazine,' to which in 1773 he added his weekly reports of books and maps; we touch upon these journals, as well as others of the same class, in this work, either very lightly or not at all, because they belong either to the bookmaking science of the Germans, or to the manner in which history was cultivated and written in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Schlözer's 'New Correspondence' on the contrary was devoted immediately to life, and to the improvement of its very defective system. Schlözer afterwards became bolder and bolder, when the governing bodies themselves saw how advantageous it

might be, for that which was hidden in finance chambers, chancery offices, in cabinets, and official bureaus, in the obscurity of secrecy, to be brought forth and announced in the clear day.

Schlözer was, in the beginning, extremely cautious not to awaken the suspicions of the Hanoverian aristocracy. He therefore carefully avoided speaking of things and places which lay near at hand, according to Napoleon's advice to the historian. His criticisms, which were always very free, but often such as were calculated to excite feelings of wonder or ridicule, were directed chiefly against foreign states and administrations. The tendency of his first unrestrained and passionate outbreaks was very welcome to those who had the direction of Hanoverian affairs in London, and especially his attachment to the person of the king and the ministry of Lord North. He raved wildly against the North Americans, and stormed at their disobedience to Parliament, as if he had been a genuine old Englishman. He warred against the Dutch patriots, and in favour of Lewis Ernest of Brunswick, as if he and his forefathers had been clients of the House of Orange. This led to the first serious public political discussions in Germany, among the writers of periodical literature, although this discussion only affected the policy and conduct of foreign states. Büsching, for example, took quite a different view of the American cause, and a violent controversy arose between him and Schlözer.

As early as the second year of his journal, we find some of these pieces, which from time to time were published by Schlözer, and which made him the terror of all the very paternal officials and the little despots of feudal Germany. All those who dwelt in darkness, in the crevices and holes of our dilapidated imperial castles, the tyrants in cowls, in their monasteries or cloisters, the selfish governors or magistrates of the imperial cities, the high-born knights of the Empire who ruled over the villages, their serene and illustrious highnesses who reigned with kingly pride in the darkneses of their castles, from whose towers the whole extent of their territories might be seen, all and each of these with single and united voices raised a murder-shout against him. Without going at any length into the subject, we can make the whole matter clear by a reference to two occurrences of the year 1777. It will be seen how the above-named usurpers of the people's rights and of those of the Emperor were provoked and enraged, when things came to light which

directed to them the attention of the empire, and which are yet existing at least in form. In the seventh number there is a notice of the concubines of the ecclesiastical lords in Munster in the year 1740, and in the same number a minute account of the appointment of a German law-court, which was of an original character; in the account indeed, the names of the persons are not mentioned, but Schlözer, in an explanation by which it is accompanied, pledges himself for the accuracy of the facts.

In the course of the year 1778, there are found, both in the essays which had been furnished and were printed by Schlözer, as well as in the short reports of correspondence, some admirable hints upon the disadvantages which were suffered by subjects as well as governments, in consequence of all political affairs being carried on and conducted with the secrecy of mysteries; this was equally applicable to the affairs of the states and of the cities. The outcry in consequence became more violent; but the influence and sale of the new journal, edited with a freedom previously altogether unknown, increased in the same or in a greater proportion. It may be seen what the condition of the public press in Germany then was, and what honour Schlözer was entitled to, because he spoke with a freedom and decision in that time, which perhaps no man would venture to do at present, by his own express declaration, that he could only receive the clearest facts, and that with great caution.

How beneficial moreover the mere shadow of free and open speech with respect to public events had become in Germany, in the course of a very few years, is remarkably exemplified from the occurrences of the year 1780. In the course of this year there appeared a document of a judicial proceeding, whose communication so embittered the minds of the Zürich council, in which the burger oligarchy ruled, with even more severity than that of the nobles in Berne, that it caused Waser, a clergyman, to be executed on account of purloining documents, which indeed was a punishable offence, but not a capital one. The Zürichers regarded Schlözer as their most fearful enemy, for he had shown himself, and especially in his contest with the Dutch patriots, to be a bitter opponent to such a kind of aristocracy as existed among them. The same volume contains a defence of Bahrdt, but only in respect of the rights of all Protestant citizens of the empire, against the unconstitutional proceedings of the imperial court and council, and also some essays upon the internal con-

dition of the German ecclesiastical states, upon the censorship and inquisition in Prague, upon the Saxon nobility, upon the government of Hesse Cassel, and finally upon the internal relations of the university of Giessen. In the following year, the emperor Joseph expressed himself very favourably with respect to the war which Schlözer carried on without intermission against the Jesuits and ex-Jesuits, and also with respect to his denunciation of ecclesiastical abuses, which excited vehement indignation in the minds of the smaller ecclesiastical princes. The Bishop of Spires felt so deeply the ridicule which he had cast upon those rights, which, as he said, had been handed down from the middle ages, that he first applied in vain in Hanover, and afterwards went direct to King George in London (1782). When the king politely declined to interfere, he then addressed himself in a circular to all the members of the imperial Diet, upon what he called Schlözer's malicious attempt, but in this case also without success.

From the year 1782, the correspondence received the title 'Notices of State Affairs,' and was increased both in size and importance. The 'Notices of State Affairs' was a magazine containing reports concerning all the individual states of Germany. This appears from a hasty review of the contents of 1784-1786, and especially from the innumerable complaints and accusations which were made by the several governments against Schlözer. The complaints by no means affected his remarks; but it was thought very undesirable, that what had happened, and could not therefore be contradicted, should be made public, and especially as was the case with the Zürich gentlemen, if the documents were favourable to the people. This happened in reference to Bavaria: Schlözer printed the proceedings of a scandalous criminal process, and the Elector made his complaint in Hanover. It happened also, on his giving an account of some establishments and privileges in Darmstadt, respecting game, which did not indeed exist at the time, but which had done so shortly before. Schlözer, as a political writer, was in the highest degree one-sided, and by no means proof against corruption, provided the bribery was only managed in a sufficiently delicate way. Money, vain honours, an order, high commendation, had so much power over him, that he sought to deceive himself in order not to be false or merely to deceive others. In proof of this, we only need to remark the great difference of his conduct in the case of the Polish

and Turkish transactions, and in those in North America and Holland. His whole position, and the relations which he had with Russia, as well as the book in which, as he himself tells us, for hard cash he made Lewis Ernest a Phocion, prove that he had very weak points about him.

The 'German Museum' took its origin contemporaneously with Schlözer's 'New Correspondence' (about 1716), the former being designed for the promotion of the new literature as the 'Notices of State Affairs' was for that of the new politics. It is unquestionably the best periodical for the people which has ever appeared in Germany; for although those that appeared in Jena and Weimar, under the protection and oversight of Göthe and Schiller, brought more important works to the notice of the public, yet the printed correspondence of the contributors proves that they had a special view, and that the Magazine was far more a bookseller's speculation than the Museum. Our best prose-writers, and some of our poets, have made their first essays in the pages of this magazine, and this procured for it afterwards a wider and easier circulation. The different years of this Museum form, as it were, a chronological survey of the labours of those men who sought to bring our language and literature up to that point of excellence which the French and the English had reached for half a century. The establishment of the Museum is one of the many services rendered to Germany and to its literature by Dohm. He shared the conduct of it with Boie, who was as assiduous to promote our prose as he had formerly been in Göttingen for the advancement of the lighter descriptions of poetry by means of the 'Almanack of the Muses,' which appeared yearly. Dohm was drawn away for some years from literary pursuits by attention to state affairs, and in this interval Boie alone conducted the Museum, which still continues to possess a value for those who are acquainted with the subject of our literature, and so much can be said for few periodicals; the most important essays which appeared in its columns have all been singly printed in an enlarged and improved form.

The undertaking was lightened and facilitated to Dohm and Boie, by the close friendship which, from the shores of the Baltic and North Sea to the boundaries of Italy, existed among all the men who were labouring to free our nation and our literature from the barbarism and despotic rule of priests and pedants, from the miserable cabals and clubs, and from the mere spirit of

handicraft and vulgarity which prevailed in our universities; these distinguished men, without being personally acquainted, had yet a trustful confidence in each other's purposes, and this enabled the editors periodically to offer something distinguished to the public. Both the conductors of the magazine enjoyed a high degree of respect, and combined with a purified taste and much and various learning a correct practical tact, which is much rarer among our scholars than either or both of the other qualities. These remarks hold good, as must be the case with periodicals from the nature of literary pursuits, especially with respect to the early years of its course, in which Boie and Dohm watched in common over the reception of essays, and superintended the conduct of the press. It is clear, from the selections they made, that they wished to form and elevate the taste and understanding of the great public, whilst they were by no means inattentive to the wishes of others, and, by an agreeable change and careful accommodation, provided for the wants of those also who were anxious for entertainment alone as the result of their reading. The tendencies, the education and mental training, the modes of thinking, of the authors of these collected essays are therefore different and often directly opposed to each other; but in one point they all agree, in morality, and zeal for the intellectual regeneration of the nation, for the banishment of all rudeness, and for genuine and solid improvement of mind.

When we examine the index of contents, we see that specimens of the works of Göthe's friend Lenz, whose genius was restrained by no laws, alternate and are interchanged with the philosophical essays of Feder, of Campe, and of Lavater. Zimmerman, who was then a favourite writer, was sometimes allowed to develop something which he called philosophy, along with the clever and witty letters of Lichtenberg written from England. Questions of political economy and administration also, or statistical subjects, as far as they could be made agreeable to the public, were treated by such men as Dohm, Jacobi, and J. G. Schlosser, and instructive prose alternated with specimens of poetry from Bürger, Claudius, the Stollbergs and Voss. That the contributions of Meissner, Sprickmann, and other writers who could not be called classical, were sometimes received, must be accounted for by the nature of such periodicals, which when once begun cannot immediately be given up.

The Göttingen professors even thought it necessary to appeal

to the public, on account of the accusations which were brought against them, of being so much enamoured of the wisdom of the rostrum, as to be indifferent both to the progress of the age and the literature of the people. The result of this determination of the Göttingen learned aristocracy, to put themselves in communication with the public, was the getting up of the 'Göttingen Magazine of Science and Literature,' which was undertaken by George Forster and Lichtenberg. The same may be said of this periodical as has already been said of the 'German Museum,' with respect to the value of its contents, almost all of which have been printed in other places and at other times. The united body of distinguished professors did not immediately, but only through Lichtenberg, declare that the magazine was intended to pave the way to new views of life. The magazine was, in reality, intended to convince its readers that there were some persons, who strongly uttered their feelings of dislike to the reigning, offensive sensibility, who scoffed at the mad genius of the Geniuses of Power, who contemned with bitterness and harshness the bombast of Lavater and his friends, who would not acknowledge the cant of the Klopstock school for genuine religious zeal, but were nevertheless favourable to all those improvements which the age demanded, and in a situation as courageously to contend for the right and the people as Schlözer himself had done. The magazine moreover was not to be polemical, not directly devoted to the defence of the Göttingen professors against the reproach of wishing aristocratically and exclusively to promote and advance only a privileged or university education, called science; but its articles were to show that they too could be popular. They were designed to make individual portions of the knowledge of the privileged classes accessible to the whole people.

All the Göttingen professors who had any confidence in their power of communicating their science immediately to the great public, in the spirit of the age, in the style and language which had been formed within the last twenty years, sent contributions to this periodical, destined, by means of intelligible and consequently entertaining articles, to oppose and counteract the whimpering and foolery, the affectation of love and of piety which prevailed. One of those who laboured the most with this view was Reimarus, the friend of Lessing, who sent numerous contributions. That such was the object of the conductors of this ma-

gazine, appears not merely from the form which was chosen, small 8vo, and from the thin numbers which they published, but Lichtenberg declares himself fully and expressly upon the subject in the preface to the series of the second year. He observes, "The editors wish to create a course of reading for the German public which, without being dull and stale, as very many of the numerous professedly entertaining periodicals are, shall be at once instructive and entertaining, without wearying the reader by its length." "The style," he continues, thus quietly indicating their line of writing to the contributors, "the style is intended to be light and easy, but always serious prose, no stale, whining, or empty bombast."

Lichtenberg and Forster kept their word, which, in the case of those who undertake such works as a mere money speculation, is seldom the case; and these men, who, on account of their love of science would have felt horror at a generation educated by Basedow and Campe, condescended to show by the fact, that they could be more practically able and more entertainingly instructive than the renowned councillors of education or the sentimental book-manufacturers. In order to prove this, without enumerating or examining individual essays and treatises, which would lead us too far from our object, we shall merely quote some words from Lichtenberg's preface already referred to, and then briefly allude in passing to some of the most remarkable essays, remarkable either on account of their authors or their contents. Lichtenberg expresses his thanks for the good reception which his periodical, which was to be regarded as an opposition to the fashionable foolery and sentimentality, had found from the public, and avails himself of the opportunity to speak concerning its spirit and tendencies in the following words:—"It will have a value for those readers, upon whose old German seriousness and old German mind the silver moon has had so little influence that they can still read for their amusement a journal which is not sentimental, &c. The arrangement and conduct of the journal," he adds, "will in this year continue for the most part the same as before; we shall only alter it in so far as to reconcile the absolutely permanent and unchangeable object, which is instruction, with the great changes which are ever going on in things external. We shall not therefore any longer exclude poems; but, as is obvious, we can only receive such as will not belie the title of our journal, which is scientific."

As to the single essays and their authors, it will be seen at the first glance, how strictly the promise has been fulfilled, of substituting something good and solid for the miserable and washed-out materials of the journals of that time; for no mean or discreditable papers will be found amongst them. Those papers which were received by the editors upon surveying and mining in the Palatinate cannot be reckoned as of such a character, when we consider by what able naturalists the journal was edited. The main object was, that of making real learning and university sciences accessible to the people, and of taking this task out of the hands of mountebanks, ignoramuses and scribblers, of people who made a trade of books, as other men do of wood or leather. There appeared as contributors in the first year, after and with one another, Feder, Errleben, Blumenbach, Meister, and along with them Voss, who afterwards cherished a deadly enmity against Lichtenberg, as the defender of Heyne's cause. The Göttingen professors had no sooner united in the undertaking of bringing the various questions of science before the public, the so-called unlearned, by the instrumentality of Lichtenberg, than it became impossible to exclude the unendurable Meiners, who wrote much and digested little; and in fact he appears in the third number in the course of the first year. Pütter also joined with his colleagues, and wrote a very instructive article for the poor German country-people, and in a very admirable manner, upon the 'Legality of Lotteries,' in which he showed how scandalously many of them were treated by their governments. Great and small German rulers, influenced and guided by those who laboured to increase the amount of their incomes, and who naturally stood well with them, ruined the country and the people, and particularly the poorer classes, by engaging them in ruinous speculations, against which Pütter warned them in his essay.

In the third number Lichtenberg himself explains, in a witty commentary, written in a masterly manner, the two sheets of a comical *Orbis pictus*, which he had caused to be engraved by Chodowiecki for the benefit of dramatic and poetical novel-writers and players. The fifth number contains Lichtenberg's remarkably ingenious questions to physiognomists, together with Reimarus' philosophical essays, and Blumenbach's most attractive observations upon feather polypes, which are deeply interesting, not merely to naturalists, but to everybody. In the

fifth number, even the old-fashioned scholar Michaelis endeavours to present a half theological half historical subject from the treasury of his learning, in a popular dress and form. The attempt at least, in a time of progress, was in itself thank-worthy, although it would scarcely now reward the trouble, if, the age, which is again eagerly seeking after the restoration of the old doctrines and views in such things, should ever call for the necessity of such a publication. In the form of a letter to Schlözer he endeavours to give a popular view of his notion of the chronology of the period from the flood till the reign of Solomon. Blumenbach treats his suggestion, of the advantage which may be gained by science from his newly invented expression (*Nisus formativus*) formative impulse, in so ingenious and clever a manner, that the development of his notion and what is incidentally said upon it must be read with pleasure by all, although the readers may not in general be of opinion that one unknown thing can be very clearly explained by another equally unknown.

In the sixth number appears Lichtenberg's master-piece, 'A circular letter from the Moon to the Earth,' written in opposition to that sensibility fever of the eighth decennium of the last century, which is altogether inconceivable to those who live in our practical and material times. Heyne also proves to the Germans the unavoidable necessity of improving the nature of instruction from time to time in learned schools, by making it obvious, that the greatest decay of learning had taken place in a country where all the institutions for scholars are incredibly rich. This is the proper object of his treatise upon the school-books which were used in Eton, the most renowned school of learning for youth in England. Kästner's essay also is closely connected with the general object of the magazine, and with the efforts of the age, to deliver itself from the bondage of ancient usages. George Forster's essays upon Otaheite, in which he dreamed about Elysium, and those upon Buffon's epochs of nature, rank among the most remarkable pieces in the literature of that period, although cool and experienced men may be as little inclined to follow his bold flights, as he in reality agrees with the enthusiastic Buffon, whom he so highly eulogizes.

Girtanner appears in like manner in the first number of the second year, but he was unavoidable in his time, and as inseparable from the Göttingen professors as Meiners, who really be-

longed to them. The essays in the second and third numbers of this year are conceived and composed in quite a different spirit from Girtanner's manufactured articles. They relate to the trading aristocracy of Zürich, by whom Waser the clergyman was judicially murdered. These essays had been preceded by one upon Waser's last examination, and upon his deeply moving separation from his sons, who were yet in their childhood. A certain W. G. Becker had just at this time played the character of a sentimental hypocritical sophist, and with some ability, in favour of the bloody-minded Zürich councillors. This circumstance excited great surprise in Germany at that time. This could no longer possibly be the case, such conduct would now rather be honoured as meritorious. His defence of his patrons was couched in the form of a long letter to the sentimental Gleim, in which, as daily happens, the personal character of the man on whom the right, which by time had become a wrong, was exercised, was had recourse to, in order to excuse those who conducted themselves and treated others at the end of the eighteenth century, as had been the practice in the middle ages. As Waser was not executed on account of the document which had been communicated to Schlözer, but on account of other documents which had been removed, Becker sought to prove that he was a violent and wicked man, who cared nothing for the means which he employed in order to carry out his designs. He wished, as is the custom with such sneaking advocates, to divert the public opinion, which was strong and vehement against the Zürich aristocracy, from the true merits of the question, by pushing forward and dwelling on the personal character of the man. The question was not so much Waser's character or his offence, as that all those Germans who were striving with all their might against the middle ages, knew that there were many cities in the holy Roman empire which had constitutions similar to that of Zürich, and that persons should venture in the enlightened and sentimental times of the close of the eighteenth century, to call a state a republic in which such a method of administering justice prevailed, as that by which the unfortunate Waser, under the appearance of right, was brought to the scaffold.

This is one of the chief things which Schlözer in this magazine, devoted to the promotion of sound and educated intelligence, brings forward in opposition to the allies of the tender school of Klopstock, Bodmer and Gleim, after having previously repeat-

edly declared his opinion with respect to the case of Waser in his notices of state affairs. He communicated an essay to the magazine, which unquestionably is among the most admirable things which he ever wrote,—an essay written in a tone and manner in which no Göttingen professor of the present day can or dare write. This essay is contained in the fourth number, along with Kästner's, which we have already mentioned, in which he shows how matters are carried on in Germany. Kästner, in his remarkable essay written on occasion of Kepler's inventory of property or rather of poverty, shows how the greatest men in Germany are treated if they neither teach nor follow some bread-winning science, or are not employed in some way, whatever it may be, about a court or in a state capital. Schlözer's essay in reply to Becker's miserable sophistries bears this heading:—‘Preliminary and loose Remarks upon Becker's Letter with respect to the Prosecution of Waser.’ He indicates his opinions and the contents of his essay in an admirable manner by the motto:—

“Vergiftet war sein deutscher Sinn
Von Oligarchenluft.”

Poison'd was his German sense
By oligarchy's breath.

We shall also mention another essay upon German literature, which may be reckoned amongst the number of those which were written in the spirit of the new and joyful tendency of that time. The title ‘Göttingen Magazine,’ and Heyne's great weight as a university diplomatist and politician, led Lichtenberg to mix himself up in such a way in the controversy which arose between Heyne and Voss, that the position of the contributors to the Magazine towards the originator of the new literature in Germany became wholly altered. Lichtenberg, at the close of the third number, allowed an article to be inserted which contained a bitter satire upon the insignificant quarrel which Voss had begun. This was entitled ‘An Inquiry into the manner in which the Sheep of ancient Greece bleated.’

On Spittler's account, we must mention another Göttingen Magazine, although its commencement did not fall within the period which we have fixed for our present limits. We have said this mention is made on Spittler's account, because Meiners, who was also concerned in it, is never to be considered in any other point of view than as a compiler and manufacturer. Meiners' and

Spittler's 'Göttingen Historical Magazine' was commenced in 1787. The first volume of the Magazine shows how admirably Spittler knew how to avail himself of the events which were then passing in France, for the benefit of Germany. It shows how instructive the preludes to the revolution in France should have been for all those continental states which clung with the tenacity of a death-hold to the rights, claims, and usages of the middle ages. He best shows in these magazines how he united a careful and accurate study of the particular history of German states in reference to administration, constitution, and government, with his knowledge of general history, and how deeply it is to be regretted that in the following decennium he became untrue to himself and to his country. Every contribution to German or European history, which was admitted into this magazine by Spittler, throws a new light upon some weighty point of the internal history, or upon some part of foreign relations which had been either neglected or overlooked. An enumeration and a detail of the contents of the articles contributed by Spittler would fully explain and establish this remark, if the subject and its contents did not extend far beyond our prescribed limits. The suitableness of Spittler's contributions to the time and its necessities, their complete adaptation to the requirements of Germans, brought up after the fashion of the olden times, as well as the regularity and systematic nature of their design, will be best understood by comparing them with the tasteless compilations and treatises which were introduced by Meiners. Thus only can it be clearly seen what is the value of the one and the worthlessness of the other; for all Meiners' essays are destitute of sound understanding and noble feeling, and are shamelessly and insolently dogmatical and positive.

C. F. Moser, by means of his 'Patriotic Archives,' from the year 1784, had attempted to accomplish for the whole of Germany what Spittler, by his essays in this magazine, in his way fully and admirably carried out. Moser, however good his views were, could not effect what he desired, and what the circumstances of the times required, because the nature of his religious views and feelings corresponded rather with those of the fifteenth than with those of the eighteenth century, and were therefore more in accordance with the forms of outward life of that period than with those of his own. Holding fast to what was old in this respect, like Jung Stilling, Hamann, Claudius, and others,

he became inconsistent, because in other respects he eagerly promoted reform, and pursued the same path with those men in North Germany, who were zealous for the reformation of all those abuses which were bound up with the ancient systems. On this ground alone it is possible either to explain or comprehend that singular mixture of admirable original reports, his bold remarks upon the history of the Palatinate, and his daring assaults, such as had been never heard of in Germany, upon courts and placemen, upon law-courts and chanceries, upon the mistresses, finances, and government of the German princes, which alternate with edifying discourses and with narratives which belong more properly to a work for religious education than to political archives.

It will however be readily perceived, by examining carefully the numbers of the first two years of his magazine (1784, 1785), that C. F. Moser's object, which he hoped to attain by means of his journal, was the same with those of Schlözer and Spittler, although they started from different points, and aimed at carrying their views into effect in different ways. He has statistics, diplomatic relations, and political economy less in his eye than the undertakers of the 'North German Journal.' He does not write, properly speaking, in the spirit of his age; for his style, his language, his manner, are antiquated; but he also desires to be a reformer after his own fashion, and to bring back society to its former purity and integrity. In the course of his career, as manager for, and even as minister of the small German despots, he became well acquainted with the labyrinths of a service into which men are obliged to enter in order to gain recompense and bread; he contends against this servility in his 'Archives' by historical proofs, and refutes the reigning prejudice, that every man who was appointed to an office in any particular German state, every paid placeman, neither belonged to the people as a citizen, nor to the whole nation as a patriot, but was completely subject to the will of his ruling lord or prince.

In this last respect the 'Archives' are peculiarly remarkable, as showing that, even as late as the time of the first French national assembly, people in Germany had not the slightest suspicion of the true relation which exists between a citizen of the state and the higher powers. On account of our object, we keep this point always clearly in our eye; but Moser injured his views on this subject by the long, pious, uninteresting articles which he

received into his journal. Among these we may mention the tedious account given from the very commencement of the magazine of the praying Ernest (Bet-Ernst), Duke of Gotha. Moser had correctly remarked, and makes it obvious in the 'Archives,' but all in vain, that the want of true patriotism and of noble moral courage against internal enemies and tyrants among the Germans, was closely connected with the condition of their universities and their learning, with the corporate spirit or the love of reputation, and vulgarity of their professors, with the exclusive pursuit of mere gainful studies, and the converting learned studies into mere memoriter exercises and handicraft. He therefore explains it to be his object, in his undertaking, to call the attention of the Germans to those points by means of documents, narratives, and his own remarks; and to show that in Germany, general principles are looked upon as valid, which it is neither possible to make coincide with reason and morals, nor with history; that therefore people entertain the notion that every public officer in every department is the unconditional servant of the ruling superior, and as such bound to regard his fancies and humour as laws. He earnestly labours to resist and refute this principle; he gives us therefore to understand, that he has not merely the history of the time in his view, like Schlözer, but the historical and political instruction of the nation in general, and the application of single histories of former times for the promotion of this object. With respect to this point, he expresses himself in his introduction, in his own singular style, as follows:—

“My view extends to real information, improvement, and edification; I seek for corn and not straw, and, without despising flowers, I am more concerned about fruit. Mere historical, mere statistical reports are not therefore within the scope of my wishes or my collections, still less such anecdotes and personalities as belong only to chronicles of scandal. A physician and an anatomist is one thing, an executioner and hangman is another.”

The manner in which he has carried out his plan will be best seen by the examination of those articles which he has headed 'Cabinet-pieces.' We shall point out the manner in which he commences in the case of two men, in whose description he furnishes some hints extremely useful for our times, in which we have hundreds of this species of political and religious sophists. He describes two of these men, who, like those of our days,

know how to apply and to present history, law, and religion in such a way as will serve the interests of those for whom they write. In the second volume he describes a liberal and a servile or an absolutist sophist, in the persons of the Bavarian jurist Ickstadt and of Schubart, who was at that time (1785) a zealous opponent of despotism and a defender of the Wirtemberg rights, and who was afterwards sent to a fortress by the Duke of Wirtemberg. The case is placed by him with great cleverness by means of Iselin's words in the light from which he wishes his German fellow-countrymen to view such sophists, biographers, and historians as write after the manner of advocates, and of whom we have a superabundance. Schubart, the Wirtemberg martyr of 1785, had written a life of the well-known Bavarian publicist Ickstadt, who, as an advocate of the cause of Charles the Seventh, had published a defence of the Bavarian claims upon Austria. Ickstadt, as was natural, was greatly praised in the biography; Moser in reference to both men brings this point prominently forward.

He says, in order to show the species of writers who make black white, he will introduce a passage from Iselin's review of the above-mentioned book, in which his views of such special pleadings are declared. "If this learned writer," it runs, "instead of entering the Bavarian service, had found a comfortable place at the court of Vienna, then he must necessarily have discovered that to have been wrong which he has defended as right. Could there be a more miserable lot for a man of understanding, than that of being merely looked upon as the tool of selfishness and obstinacy? How much do not such things dishonour learning! What a degrading thing it is, to have no other standard of right and justice than the ignorance or prejudices of a prince! O young man, young man, who devotest thyself to the study of law, rather throw all thy books into the fire, and go and become an honest shoemaker or tailor, than a mere writer of deductions (a special-pleader) for him who pays the best!"

In another article of the volume, No. 26, called 'Court Publicists,' the relation of the 'Archives,' which was not undertaken by an innovator, but by a lawyer and statesman, in short by a man of the old stamp, well-acquainted with life and public affairs, is pointed out to the circumstances of Moser's time, and to the officials and placemen of the ordinary description. We quote the

passage, because it so strikingly delineates the conservative bread jurists. "The court publicists," it runs, "who would willingly make our German imperial nobles independent and unlimited lords, and who wish to set them free from the treaties, agreements, &c. entered into by their forefathers, or which have even sprung from themselves, are accustomed to put forward this as their chief reason that the German ruling princes had inherited all imaginable rights of dominion from the most ancient times, and that they could not relinquish those rights to the prejudice of their reigning successors. Their subjects are merely regarded by them as the subjects of oriental princes, whose bodies, lives, goods and chattels must stand every instant at the service of their despotic rulers."

From these Archives, written by no visionary, but by a thoroughly practical man of business, deeply learned in history and in law, we learn how difficult a thing it was, and is, to lead Germans to any true love of their country, to cherish any free and noble thoughts, and to infuse any feeling of independence into men who have been trained in a servile condition in their father's house, who have had servility stamped on their minds and hearts by their superiors, and by their professors, who labour merely for their pay, who have grown up in the indulgence of sensualities, and whose conversation has been only of the wine-house, the duel, and the official appointment. He relates to us what was said to himself, by a very distinguished official man, in consequence of his own freedom of opinion and his zeal for the promotion of the great principle of equal justice to all, in which we see precisely the personified handicraft routine of German official life. We shall leave the reader to peruse for himself the whole of the conversation which is given word for word by Moser in 1781, and shall only here introduce a few of the questions and answers in the commencement of the dialogue, in order to show how absurd it appeared to a German official, that a man should think of anything but his own advantage, that it should ever occur to him to say, or to write, much less to do, anything in favour of the rights of the people or any part of them, in opposition to his interests, or perhaps even with danger to his liberty. Moser introduces this representation of official dignity in the first lines of the dialogue, speaking after this fashion: "You will go on precisely in this way, till the same fate overtakes you that befel your father

before you ;” to which he answers, “That would do me great honour.” The other replies, “This is the very first time I have ever heard that any man thought it an honour to be shut up within four walls.” Moser answers with truth—“Provided, sir, it were for the sake of a good cause,” &c.

These patriotic Archives derive great importance and value from another reason, from the particular reports which are printed respecting the history of the Palatinate and other histories, because, in consequence of the petty and contemptible secrecy of the courts and authorities, and the incredible servility of the so-called historiographers of these high and mighty lords and gentry, we have only authentic records of one side of life, and the historian can only write about the transactions of chiefs and states, without being able to penetrate beyond the surface, or enter into the marrow of his subject, the life of the people. We are remarkably deficient in memoirs ; French history suffers and groans under their superfluity. It contains only anecdotes ; and besides those memoirs, which are truthful and trustworthy, there are many that are mere inventions. What Moser has here communicated are descriptions of single occurrences, or representations of certain characters and transactions considered from an individual and sometimes very limited point of view : but for this very reason they are the more useful, as mere materials, to an historian who has already formed his principles and his views of life.

Among these pieces, to give a few examples, we reckon the ‘Life of Duke Ernest of Gotha,’ already mentioned, a man who was quite of a kindred spirit with Moser :—‘The Life and End of Duke Alexander of Wirtemberg,’ who died in 1735 ; and further the prosecution of the ministers Von Goerne and Von Münchenhausen, and others of a similar kind.

Contemporaneously with Moser’s patriotic Archives, and intended for the same purpose as Schlözer’s ‘Notices of Affairs of State,’ Von Göckingk projected the plan of a journal which was to be exclusively devoted to German affairs, and to bear the title ‘Journal of and for Germany.’ Göckingk, who was the contriver and editor of this periodical, was distinguished as one of the noblest members of the inferior nobility, and also as a patriot and poet. He wished to contribute his share to the reformation of his country, and to awaken the German nation from its slumber, by the instrumentality of a kind of monthly journal

after the model of the English, which was to contain reports and accounts of German life and affairs alone, such as might be sought for in vain in the miserable political and court newspapers of the time. The journal was not undertaken either as an editorial or bookseller's speculation, but for the true and patriotic purpose of giving reports of the condition of the people in the various provinces of Germany in a freer and more entertaining manner than was done in the miserable newspapers of the day, in which accounts of state and court affairs were written in the language and manner of court lacqueys. Göckingk himself informs us that he selected as his model the London 'Gentleman's Magazine.'

Göckingk from the very commencement experienced how difficult it was, even for one of the most respected and most worthy men in Germany, to be the instrument of giving publicity of any kind, even although it were only to law cases and reports, to that which had occurred in any corner of Germany, and which any official or placeman whatsoever did not wish to meet the public eye. After the first half year he associated with himself as his assistant in this publication a man who was animated with the same zeal for the reformation of certain countries and cities in Germany, which were still steeped in all the darkness of the middle ages. Göckingk became so much harassed and annoyed by the consequences of this bold undertaking, that he altogether retired from it in 1785, and left it to his friend to carry forward. The friend who was united in this undertaking with Von Göckingk was the Dome Capitular and President of Fulda, Von Bibra. He continued to superintend the journal from this time forward, and to carry it on with the same freedom of mind in which it had been projected and commenced, as far at least as that was possible. We believe that we shall most easily and best explain the condition and relations of Germany, upon which the work wholly bears, as well as the contents and spirit of the work itself, by introducing Von Göckingk's explanation of his own views in its establishment. This indeed is the only reason for which we mention it here in this documentary history of the inward and mental life of Germany. It will be seen from Göckingk's words, that his intention in bringing personal questions before the public, and of citing before the tribunal of a sound public opinion, as is done in England, cases which cannot be brought before any legal tribunal, or juridically proved and established, was alto-

gether excellent, but that the greatest obstacles were immediately thrown in the way of its execution. How could such a course have been possible, when there existed an incalculable number of states and rulers of all kinds, who thought themselves above and beyond the law, which cannot be done now, when there are only two-and-thirty of them?

In his announcement, Göckingk observes, that he has undertaken the journal, because among the numerous periodicals there is not one by means of which the different great and small states of Germany, so completely separated from one another by their particular rulers, governments and laws, are made acquainted with one another, or at least there is none by which this object is fully attained. Never, until this hour—such are his words—has any newspaper-writer ventured to introduce an article into his paper with respect to the most worthy private person, if the man was not at least an imperial baron, or one of the highest servants of the state; and yet an account of Degenhard the manufacturer is incomparably more interesting than a description of court festivities, hunts and balls. But their readers are accustomed to the one and not to the other. In some of these respects the state of the case is so much altered that we now run into the opposite extreme. Göckingk was far from having overlooked the difficulty, which must stand in the way of every such undertaking, from the limited relations which are the results of life in small towns, so common to the Germans, from the irritability and sensitiveness which belong to people who are brought up in such circumstances, in all matters which affect personal affairs. He says:—

“It has occurred to me that the German writers are too little observant of individuals, and yet accounts which affect individual characters are by far the most profitable, on account of the impression they make upon the heart. Individual peculiarities and character shall therefore be more the characteristic of the journal than mere social relations.” The most of the articles which appeared during the first year of publication were free from all captious fault-finding or unbecoming severity, because the editor, as a very rich man, looked for no personal advantage, but on the other hand paid the chief cost out of his own pocket. Göckingk opened the journal with an article, than which it would have been impossible for him from thousands to have selected a better. In the first three monthly numbers

there appeared a number of letters, which exhibited in a most striking and remarkable manner the highly absurd and ridiculous pride of the German order of imperial knights, the foolish insolence of the small and, for the most part, newly created princes, and the tone which both classes were in a condition to assume.* For this purpose he brought before the public an original individual of the Siegfried von Lindenberg species. The individual to whose letters we have just referred was the same Cologne Electoral Privy-councillor Free Baron von Münster-Landegge, whose dispute with the Count von Lippe will be mentioned in the first part of the political history.

This free lord Von Münster-Landegge was married to the daughter of a countess who was at the same time herself a member of a family of equal rank. In consequence of the rank of his mother-in-law, (who was a countess by birth and by marriage,) he believed himself to be related to the highest families, and among others to the King of Sardinia and to the Princes of Hohenlohe, and as such he thought it necessary to announce to them the death of his mother-in-law, which took place on his estate of Landegge. The King of Sardinia sent him a polite answer, inquired very little about the correctness of the relationship, but overjoyed the Baron by addressing him "My Cousin," of which title, as is well known, the French Chancery was not very sparing; but how embittered and enraged there-

* Von Göckingk has taken this view of the matter, and we do not think we can better point out the relation of the letters to their time, and to the men of that time, than by copying the words which Von Göckingk prefixes to the letters.—"The courts and the nobility," he says, "have been used to look at the contests of learned men with the same pleasure as that with which the court and the grantees in Madrid look on at a bull-fight. In this perhaps they are not much to blame; but we cannot but express our astonishment, that many of them appeared to be pleased, that controversies were carried on between scholars as they were; for their memory must have played them a slippery trick. The controversies indeed of the great and of the nobles have not been printed in the same manner as those of the learned, arising from long custom, but they are nevertheless well enough known. They interest however but a very small portion of the public, because they have seldom, if ever, anything to do with literature, and the parties are rarely known beyond their own provinces." He then tries to justify the learned on account of their quarrels, and concludes, "I know no better means of weakening this prejudice against the character of the learned in the eyes of the great and the noble, than by giving half a dozen examples of such strifes as have occurred among themselves. The following correspondence, which took place between a German prince and a German baron, which was circulated in manuscript at Geneva and in other places, may serve for a beginning."

fore was the self-sufficient and vehement imperial Baron, when the insignificant Princes of Hohenlohe-Bartenstein and Schillingfürst, whose hand-breadth of a territory had been erected into a principality by Francis the First, in 1754, declined both the letter and the relationship? They rudely repulsed the Baron's forwardness, and by a letter of their common government declared, they wished to hear nothing of his cousinship, and expressed themselves as highly indignant that they had been addressed only as High-born Princes of the Empire, instead of Illustrious High-born* (for the title Highness did not belong to them), and thereupon arose a controversy of a most burlesque description with the Baron, who challenged them. We subjoin the letter of the Hohenlohe government, for the same reason as Von Göckingk printed it, in order that it may be seen what was the condition of the officials who prepared and sent such master-pieces, and of the subjects of such Siegfrieds, who had more to fear from them than the Baron von Münster-Landegge †. This quarrel was carried on with such vehemence that he sent a formal cartel, and still more because Schillingfürst was too old, he threw his glove like a knight of the middle ages at the feet of Bartenstein. It is difficult to say whether the challenge of the Baron ‡, or the answer of the Prince von Bartenstein is the most absurd, or most characteristic of the ridiculous pride of the age and of the men. Among other things the Prince writes, that he would rather first instruct the Baron, than immediately follow the advice of the Prince von Schilling-

* Hochgeborne Reichsfürsten, and not as durchlauchtig hochgebornen.

† The Minute No. 2. January, p. 7. is headed: "Letter of the Government of the Princes von Hohenlohe-Bartenstein and Schillingfürst, to Baron von Münster-Landegge.—Two letters of notification have been received from the Baron von Münster-Landegge, Baron, Privy Councillor and Chamberlain of the Electorate of Cologne, dated at Landegge near Münster, 18th March, a.c. to Serenissimum Nostrorum of H. and W. High princely illustrious Highnesses, with altogether strange and unusual superscriptions, expressions of courtesy and reverence. Although Serenissimi do not send back the so-mentioned in all respects unseemly writings from particular motives, yet their Highnesses wish to forbid and put a stop to similar correspondence, which from special command most graciously received is without delay to be communicated to the Lord Privy Councillor."

‡ The tone in which this correspondence was carried on will appear from the few first lines of No. 3.—"Allow me once more to transgress the law, in which you forbid me all further correspondence, and which six feet from the throne where it was delivered is without doubt very much to be respected, beyond that small circle however which nature has prescribed to it, is a subject of laughter," &c.

fürst, that they should in common adopt without further ceremony such serious measures as must necessarily be attended with very disagreeable consequences to him.—“Learn therefore,” he continues, “my Lord, that there is a great distinction between the higher and the lower nobility,—a distinction which, down to this day, has been recognized by the whole Empire and by its chief head on every opportunity. Learn that, although a respectable old noble of whatever rank he be deserves respect, yet the rank of a reigning Prince and member of the Empire is indisputably higher, nobler, and admits of no comparison with the inferior classes. Learn that the rank of a Prince, or member of the Empire, places his honour beyond the reach of any injury which another not his equal can offer to it, were he a hundred times a nobleman, or had he ever such good grounds to complain.” As all the rest of the letters is composed in the same tone, and all the following letters of the Baron in a similar one, in his attempt to maintain the dignity of his order, we see how completely such a correspondence was suited to the undertakers of such a journal, and what rich materials it afforded for turning into ridicule pretensions which in that time had become obsolete, and which our time again wishes to make new.

Moreover the connection of a newspaper, a weekly, and much more a monthly periodical for the whole empire, with a journal which contains essays calculated to be of general use, is singular but not contradictory ; and if specimens of Bürger’s translation of the Iliad in hexameters were given after he had tried it in iambics, that was only a service which one poet rendered to another. In the then existing arrangements of the imperial courts it was something quite new, that a subject which gives the English newspapers their particular interest for those who wish to become acquainted with the nature of domestic and social life, and for which several newspapers in France are established, should for the first time in this journal have been communicated not only to jurists but to the great public. Such were the transactions of the Diet at Ratisbon, remarkable suits before the privy council in Vienna and the imperial chamber of justice in Wetzlar. It is thus seen, that the difference was felt between our people and those who have public actions and open courts, and that two men belonging to the most distinguished nobility made the attempt to place the Germans also in a position to

become acquainted with their rights and laws in life, and that from judicial actions.

The rapid course of the French revolution had afterwards a restrictive and disturbing effect upon the right bank of the Rhine, down till the time of the French empire. A conservative anxiety spread among princes, nobles, privileged and distinguished scholars, who always hasten in Germany to anticipate the government, whilst in Paris and London they wait at least till they are sought, which indeed never fails to be the case. The two great organs of publicity in political things, Schlözer's 'Notices of State Affairs,' and the 'Journal of and for Germany,' could not therefore resist the influence of the movement, which was in the mass as retrograde in Germany as it was progressive in France. About the time in which French freedom was greeted with triumph on the left bank of the Rhine, every organ of freedom in Germany was constrained to silence by the raging of the spirit of feudality; Schlözer's 'Notices of State Affairs,' as well as the 'Journal of and for Germany,' ceased. Schlözer had moreover long previously altered his tone, as will be seen from the numbers of the year 1793, which are altogether inoffensive. The essay by which the 'Notices of State Affairs' properly speaking made shipwreck, did not at all affect politics, but concerned a personal affair of Schlözer, in which he gave free course to the superabundant vehemence of his passionate character.

APPENDIX.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

AUTHORS MENTIONED IN THE SECTIONS UPON GERMAN LITERATURE.

* * * The following List, with the accompanying notices, has been compiled by the Translator with a view to identify the principal individuals and to facilitate a reference to the works of the various writers to whom the Historian refers. He has not deemed it necessary to include the French and English authors, because their names will be found in all those ordinary biographies and other sources of information which are easily accessible to every reader.

- Abbt, Thomas.*—Born at Ulm 1738 ; died at Bückeburg 1766 ; author of a History of Portugal. Berl. 1768, 6 vols. 8vo.
- Alberti, Valentin.*—Born at Leipzig 1635 ; died 1697. Logic : Metaphysics : Disputations with Puffendorf and Thomasius on Natural Rights, &c.
- Arndt, Jo.*—Born in Halberstadt 1555, died in Zelle 1611. Six Books of True Christianity : Halle, 1830, 8vo. Four Books of True Christianity : Nürnberg, 1836. The language in both modernized.
- Arnold, Gottfried.*—Born at Annaberg 1666 ; Professor in Giessen ; Preacher in several places ; Inspector and Pastor in Perleberg, where he died 1714. History of Churches and Heretics : Frankfurt, 1699, 4 vols. fol.
- Alringer, Johann Baptist von.*—Born in Vienna 1755 ; died in Vienna 1797. Coll. works, 20 vols. large 8vo⁷ ; Vienna, 1812.
- Archenholz, Von.*—Born at Danzig 1745, died near Hamburg 1812.
- Amthor, Christoph. Herm.*—Born at Stolberg, in Thuringia, 1678, died 1721 ; Professor of Moral Philosophy in Kiel, Historian, and Poet.
- Bahrdt, Carl Frederick.*—Born at Bischoffswerda, died at Halle 1792 ; Apparatus Criticus. Systema Theologiæ. Letters upon the Bible. System of Dogmatics, of Theological Morals, &c.
- Basedow, Johann Bernard.*—Born at Hamburg 1723, died in Magdeburg 1790.

- Batteux, Charles Des.*—Born near Rheims 1713, died 1780. *Les Beaux Arts réduits à un même principe*: Paris, 1746. Translated by Schlegel: Leipzig, 1751: 8vo. *Cours de Belles Lettres, ou Principes de la Littérature*, 1747–50. 5 vols. 12mo. Imitated and commented on by Ramler in his *Einleitung in die schönen Wissenschaften*: Leipzig, 1758, 4 vols. 8vo.
- Baumgarten, Sigismund Jacob.*—Born 1706, Berlin. Hermeneutics, Exegesis, Antiquities, Dogmatics, a most voluminous writer on the whole circle of Theology.
- Baumgarten, Alex. Gott.*—Born in Berlin 1714. Professor of Philosophy in Halle and Frankfort on the Oder. *Æsthetics, Morals, Metaphysics, &c.*
- Baumgarten, Nathaniel* (brother of the two above-named).—Poet; *Dying Socrates*, and other works. Died 1756.
- Behker, Balthasar.*—Born in West Friesland 1624. Preacher in the Reformed Church. *Betoovelde Wereld*, 4 books. Amdel 1691.
- Beemann, Gust. Bernh.*—Born at Dewitz 1720, died 1784. *Beemmannorum fratrum Consilia et Decisiones Juris post Obitum natu majoris Gust. Bern. Beemanni edidit natu minor Dav. Hen. Beemann*: Gött. Par. 4to, May 1784.
- Besser, Johann von.*—Born in Courland 1654. A courtier in Berlin, Master of Ceremonies and Poet Laureat in Prussia, and afterwards in the service of King Augustus of Poland. Died 1729. His works were edited by Von König: Leip. 1732, 2 vols. 8vo.
- Blum, Joachim Christian.*—Born at Rattenau 1739, died 1790. *Collected Poems*: Leip. 1776, 2 vols. 8vo.
- Blumauer, Aloys.*—Born at Steyer in Austria 1755, died in Vienna 1798. *Collected Works*: Leip. 1801, 8 vols. 8vo: also München, 3 vols. 1830.
- Bodmer, Johann Jakob.*—Born at Greifensee in Switzerland 1698, died at Zürich 1783. Translated Milton's *Paradise Lost*, wrote 16 different works, not collected.
- Boie, Heinrich Christian.*—Born at Meldorp in Holstein 1744, died same place 1806. Editor of the *Musen-Almanach*. This periodical first appeared at Göttingen 1770. Kästner supported the Magazine, but Boie alone was editor from 1771–5; Göckingk from 1776–8; Bürger from 1779–94; Reinhardt till 1805. *Hamburg Musen-Almanach*, edited by Voss: Lauenburg 1775, 12mo: in Hamburg from 1777–90: from 1790–1800 New Strelitz. Göckingk was a contributor from 1777–86.
- Bonnet, Charles.*—Born in Geneva 1720, died 1798: Government Naturalist. Works: 8 vols. 4to. Neufchatel, 1799–83.
- Braue, Joachim Wilhelm von.*—Born at Weissenfels, died in Dresden, 1758. Dramatist.
- Bretzner, Christoph Friedrich.*—Born in Leipzig 1748, died same place 1807; Dramatist and Satirist. *Rake's Progress*, after Hogarth, &c.
- Breitinger, Johann Jakob.*—Born at Grafensee near Zürich 1701, died at Zürich 1783. *Criticism on the Art of Poetry*, 3 vols. 8vo: Zürich, 1720.
- Bremen Contributions*, 1745–48, 6 vols. 8vo.—The first two volumes

were published by J. M. Dreyer ; the first four by Karl Christian Gästner. With these were connected a collection of Miscellanies by the authors of the New Bremen Contributions : Leipzig, 1748–54, 3 vols. 8vo. First published by Johann Andreas Cramer (born at Jöhstadt, in the Erzgebirge, died at Kiel 1778) : second by Johann Adolf Schlegel and Nicolaus Dietrich Gisecke (born at Gürz, in Lower Hungary, 1724, died at Sonderhausen 1765).

Bronner, Franz Xavier.—Born at Höchstadt 1758. Works, 3 vols. 8vo : Zürich, 1794.

Brücker, Johann Jac.—Born at Augsburg 1696, died 1770. History of Philosophy. Translated into various languages, into English by Enfield : and other Works.

Brühl, Graf von.—Born 1700, died 1763. Minister of Augustus King of Poland and Elector of Saxony.

Brookes, Barthold Heinrich.—Born at Hamburg 1680 ; magistrate in his native city, and died there 1747. Collected Works : Hamburg, 1797, 9 vols.

Bürger, Gottfried Augustus.—Born at Wolmersmende in Halberstadt 1748, died at Göttingen 1794. Collected Works, 8 vols. 8vo : Gött. 1829–33.

Büsching, Anton. Fried.—Born at Stadthagen 1724, died in Berlin 1793. Geographer and Historian.

Brandes, Johann Christoph.—Born at Stettin 1735, died in Berlin, 1799. Works : Hamburg, 1790–1, 8 vols. 8vo.

Calovius, Abraham.—Born at Mohrungen in Prussia 1612, died 1686. Professor of Theology in Wittenberg, a Lutheran zealot.

Campe, Joachim Heinrich.—Born at Deersen in Brunswick 1746, died at Brunswick 1815.

Carpzovius, J. G.—Born in Dresden 1679, died 1767. Crit. Sacra Vet. Test. 4to : Lipsiæ, 1748. Introd. ad Lib. Can. Vet. Test. 3 vols. 4to : Lips. 1741–57. Apparatus Hist. Crit. Antiq. Sacr. cod. et gent. Hebr. 4 maj. : Lipsiæ, 1747.

Canitz, Friedrich Rudolf Ludwig von.—Born in Berlin 1654. Travelled in Europe. Courtier and Privy Councillor in Prussia. Died 1699. His poems passed through thirteen editions ; the most complete is that of Von König : Berlin, 1765.

Chodowicki, Daniel Nicolas.—Born at Danzig 1726, died in Berlin 1801. A renowned engraver. Director of the Academy of Arts in Berlin. His engravings exceed 3000 in number.

Claudius, Matthias.—Born at Reinfeld near Lubeck 1743, died 1815. Wrote under the names of Asmus or Wandsbeck Messenger. Asmus omnia sua secum portans. Works, 8 vols. : Hamburg and Gotha, 1829.

Comenius, Johann Amos.—Born near Brünn 1592, died 1571. Celebrated as a scholar, travelled to England, Sweden, Holland ; a Superintendent of the Moravian Brethren.

Cronegh, Johann Fried. Freikerr von.—Born at Anspach 1731, died at Nuremberg 1758. Works, 2 vols. ed. Uz : Anspach, 1771–3.

Crusius, C. A.—Born at Merseberg 1722, died in Leipzig 1775. Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Exegesis, Philosophy. Works published from 1767–78 : Leipzig.

- Danov, Ernest Jak.*—Born near Danzig 1741, drowned at Jena 1782. Professor of Theology in Jena.
- Darjes, J. G.*—Born at Güstrow 1714, died 1791. Principles of Morals, large 8vo : Jena, 1782. Way to Truth : Frankfort a M., 1775.
- Dohm, C. W. von.*—Born at Lemgo 1751, died at Nordhausen 1820. Alliance of the German Princes : Berlin, 1785. History of the English and French in the East Indies : Leip. 1786. And other Works.
- Dusch, Johann Jakob.*—Born at Zelle 1725, died at Altona 1787. Collected Works : Altona, 1765–67, 3 vols. 8vo.
- Dale, Anton von.*—Born at Haarlem 1688, died 1708. Merchant, then Divine, and Menmonite Leader.
- Ebert, Johann Arnold.*—Born at Hamburg 1723, died at Brunswick 1795. Letters and Miscellaneous Poems : Campe, Hamburg, 2 vols. 8vo, 1789–95.
- Eberhard, Johann Aug.*—Born at Halberstadt 1739, died Halle 1809. Professor of Philosophy, Apology of Socrates, Amyntor, Æsthetics, &c.
- Edelman, Johann Christ.*—Born 1698, died Berlin 1767. Renowned as an opponent of revelation : pantheistic Philosopher.
- Eichhorn, J. G.*—Born in Hohenlohe Öhringen 1752. General Library of Biblical Literature, 10 vols. 8vo : Leipzig, 1788–1801. Numerous historical, critical, and exegetical works.
- Ernesti, J. A.*—Born at Tennstadt 1707, died as Professor of Theology in Leipzig 1781. New Theological Library, 10 vols. 8vo. Hermeneutics, Critic. Exegesis, and other subjects.
- Engel, Johann Jakob.*—Born at Parchim in Mecklenburg 1741, died 1802. Collected Works : Berlin, 1801–6, 12 vols. 8vo.
- Ewald, Johann Joachim.*—Born at Spandau 1727, died in Italy (?). Songs and Lyries : Berlin, 1791, 8vo, Dresden, 1836.
- Fassman, David.*—Born at Wiesenthal, Erzgebirge. Historian and Linguist. Died 1799.
- Feder, Johann George.*—Born in Schornwaisach 1741, died 1821. Logic, Metaphysics, Belles Lettres, &c.
- Fichte, John Gottlieb.*—Born at Rammenau in Upper Lusatia 1762, professor of philosophy in Jena 1794; lived in Berlin 1799–1805; professor in Erlangen 1810; professor in Berlin 1814. One of the most celebrated of the German speculative philosophers.
- Fischart, J.*—Born either in Mayence or Strasburg, in the former half of the sixteenth century. Lived at Saarbruck, and died there 1589. Lucky Ship of Zürich, with a Commentary by Uhland : Tübingen, 1828, 8vo.
- Forster, Johann Adam George.*—Born at Nassenhuben near Danzig, died in Paris 1794. Professor of Natural History in the Carolinum at Cassel.
- Franke, Aug. Hermann.*—Born at Lubeck 1663, died in Halle 1727. The celebrated founder of the Orphan House in Halle, and professor in that university.
- Fuchs, Leonh. von.*—Born at Wemdingen in the Upper Palatinate 1510, died 1566. Professor at Ingolstadt.
- Garve, Christian.*—Born at Breslau 1742, died same place 1798. Pro-

- fessor of Philosophy, Leipzig. Treatises upon Cicero de Officiis, Moral Philosophy and Politics.
- Gatterer, Johann Christ.*—Born at Lichtenau near Nuremberg 1727, died at Göttingen 1799. History, Numismatics and Heraldry.
- Gellert, Christian Furchtegott.*—Born at Hainichen in the Erzgebirge 1715, died at Leipzig 1769. Collected Works: Leipzig, 10 parts, 8vo, 1784.
- Gessner, Salomon.*—Born at Zürich 1730, died same place 1787. Death of Abel: Zürich, 1758. Collected Works: Zürich, 1762, 4 vols. 8vo.
- Gerhard, P.*—Born at Grafenhainchen 1606, died at Lübben 1676. Loci Theologici, 22 vols. 4to: Cotta, Tübingen, 1762–68.
- Gervinus, Geo. Gottlieb.*—One of the celebrated seven Göttingen Professors, now residing in Heidelberg. History of German Poetry: Leipzig, 1835–36, 4 vols. 8vo.
- Girtaner, Christoph.*—Born at St. Gallen 1760, died in Berlin 1793. Geographer and Historian.
- Giseke, Nic. Dietrich.*—Born at Günz in Lower Hungary. One of the Editors of the Bremen Magazine. Died in Sonderhausen 1763.
- Gleim, Johann Wilhelm Ludwig.*—Born at Ermsleben in Halberstadt 1719, died at Halberstadt 1803. Collected Works by Körte: Halberstadt, 1811, 8 vols. 8vo.
- Gottsched, Johann Christoph.*—Born at Judithenkirch near Königsberg 1700, died in Leipzig 1766. Numerous Works, not collected.
- Gottsched, Luise Adelgunde Victoria.*—Born in Danzig 1713, died 1762. Wife of the above.
- Goetz, Johann Nicolaus.*—Born at Worms 1721, died in Baden. Miscellaneous Poems. Edited by Ramler, 3 vols.: Mannheim, 1807.
- Götze, Melchior.*—Collection of Sermons and Controversial Papers, 28 vols.: Magdeburg, 1759–68.
- Gotter, Friedrich Wilhelm.*—Born at Gotha 1746, died same place 1797. Poems, 2 vols.: Gotha, 1788; 3 vols. of Remains.
- Gothe, Johann Wolfgang von.*—Born at Frankfort a M. 1749, died at Weimar. Collected Works, complete edition: Stuttgart, 55 vols. large 8vo; 1828–34.
- Guichard, Karl Gott.*—Born at Magdeburg 1742. Served under Frederick II., who called him Quintus Icilius.
- Griesbach, Io. Jak.*—Born at Butzbach in Hesse, died at Jena 1812. Synopsis Evangel.: Berol. May 8, 1809. Comment. Crit. in Nov. Test., Symbola Crit., Opuscula Acad. &c.
- Günther, Johann Christian.*—Born in Silesia, was disowned by his father in consequence of his dissolute life; died at Jena 1713. His Poems went through six editions. Best, Breslau and Leip. 1735, 8vo.
- Hamann, Johann George.*—Born at Königsberg 1730, died at Munster 1788. Collected Works by Noth: Berlin, 1821.
- Haller, Albrecht von.*—Born in Berne 1708, died 1777. Edition of his Swiss Poems anon.: Berne, 1732, 8vo. Third, emended and improved, 1743. Eleventh and last 1777. Reprint 1828.
- Hagedorn, Fried. von.*—Born in Hamburg 1708, died there 1754.

- Complete edition of his Poems, with Life, by Eschenburg: Hamburg, 1800, 5 vols. 8vo. Reprint 1825.
- Heilmann, J. C.*—Born in Mühlhausen 1718, died 1760. *Opuscula* Max. Part. Theol. Argum. Edidit E. J. Danovius: Jena, 1774. *Compend. Theol. Dogmat., Sermons, &c.*
- Hermes, Johann Timotheus.*—Born at Petznick in Pomerania 1738, died in Breslau 1816. *Histories and Novels.*
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von.*—Born at Morungen in East Prussia 1744, died at Weimar 1803. *Collected Works*, 45 vols. large 8vo. Stuttgart, 1805–20.
- Heuse, Wilhelm.*—Born at Langenwiesen in Thuringia 1749, died 1803. *Ardenglhello or the Happy Islands, and other poems: Lemgo, 1787 and 1794, 2 Parts, 8vo.*
- Heyne, Christian Gottlob.*—Born at Chemnitz 1729, died at Göttingen 1812. Philologist, Antiquarian, Prof. of Eloquence and Poetry in Göttingen; celebrated as an editor of Homer and Virgil, &c.
- Heyne, Christian Ludwig.*—Born 1754, died 1820. Better known as a writer under the name of *Anton Wall.* *Bagatelles*, 2 vols.: Leip. Dramas, &c.
- Hippel, Theodore Gottlieb von.*—Born at Gardenen in Prussia 1741, died at Königsberg 1796. *Collected Works*, 12 vols.: Berlin, 1827–28.
- Hoffmannswaldau, Christian Hoffman von.*—Born in Breslau 1618. Known to Opitz in his youth. Travelled over Europe and distinguished in his age. Councillor of the Empire, President of the Council in Breslau. Died 1679. His Poetical Works by Neukirch: Leipzig, 1695.
- Hölty, Ludwig Heinrich Christoph.*—Born at Mariensee in Hanover 1748, died at Hanover 1776. Poems edited by Voss, splendid edit.: Vienna, 1824.
- Hutten, Ulrich von.*—Born in the Castle of Stackelberg in Franconia 1488, died near the Lake of Zürich 1523. *Collected Works* with *Introd.* by Münch, 5 vols. large 8vo: Berlin, 1821–5.
- Jacobi, Fried. Hein.*—Born at Düsseldorf 1743, died 1819. *Collected Works*, 8 vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1812.
- Jacobi, Johann Georg.*—Born at Düsseldorf 1740, died at Freiburg in Breisgau 1813. *Collected Works*, 8 vols. 8vo: Zürich, 1807–22.
- Ickstadt, Joh. Adam Freiherr von.*—Born in Hesse 1702, died 1716. *Opuscula Juridica*, 2 vol. 4to, Mag.: Ingolstadt, 1747–59, and other works.
- Jerusalem, Johann Fr. Willh.*—Born at Osnabrück 1709, died at Brunswick 1789. *Sermons*, 1745.
- Iffland, Wilhelm.*—Born at Hanover 1759, died in Berlin 1814. *Dramatic Works*: Leip. 16 vols. 8vo, 1798–1802. Berlin, 17 vols. 1808.
- Iselin, Isaak.*—Born at Basle 1728, died 1782.
- Jünger, Johann Fried.*—Born in Leipzig 1759, died in Vienna 1797. Numerous Dramatic Works and Miscellaneous, not collected.
- Jung, Friedrich*, called *Stilling.*—Born at Grund in Nassau, died 1817. *Stilling's Youth and Wanderings*: Berlin, 1777, three Parts, 8vo; then, under the title of his 'Life, a true History in five Parts:' Basle and Leipzig, 1806.

- Kant, Immanuel.*—Born at Königsberg 1724, died same place 1804. Professor at Königsberg. Founder of the System of Critical Philosophy. Philosophy of True Reason and numerous other philosophical writings.
- Kästner, Abr. Gotthelf.*—Born in Leipzig 1719, died at Göttingen 1800. Epigrammatist. Works: Frankfort and Leipzig, 1800, 2 vols. 8vo.
- Kleist, Ewald Christian von.*—Born at Zeblin in Pomerania 1715, died at Frankfort 1759, in consequence of wounds received in the battle of Kunersdorf. Collected Works by Ramler: 2 vols. Berlin, 1782.
- Klinger, Fried. Maxim. von.*—Born in Frankfort-on-the-Main 1753. Collected Works: 12 vols. large 8vo, Leipzig, 1832–33.
- Klopstock, Fried. Gottlieb.*—Born at Quedlinburg 1724, died in Hamburg 1803. Messiah and other Poems. The Messiah appeared from 1748–1773. The three first Cantos in the Bremen Literary Journal, 1748, vol. iv.; the fourth and fifth Cantos, Halle 1751, 8vo; ten Cantos, Copenhagen 1755, 4to, and Halle 1756, 8vo; Cantos 11–15, Copenhagen 1768, 4to; Cantos 16–20, Halle 1773, 8vo. Collected Works: Leipzig, 1798–1817, 12 vols. 4to and 8vo.
- Klotz, C. A.*—Born at Bischofswerda in Lusatia 1738. History of Taste and Art from Coins, 8vo: Altona, 1767. Numismatics.
- Kotzebue, Augustin Fried. Ferdinand von.*—Born at Weimar 1761, murdered at Mannheim 1819. Collected Works, 44 vols.: Leipzig, 1828–29.
- König, Johann Ulrich von.*—Born at Esslingen 1688. Laureate and Master of Ceremonies at the Court in Dresden. Was ennobled and died 1744. Collected Poems by Rost: Dresden, 1745, 8vo.
- Kretschman, Carl Fred.*—Born at Zittau 1738, died 1809. Bard. Collected Works, 7 vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1784, and Zittau, 1805.
- Lange, Samuel Gotthold.*—Born at Halle 1711, died at Laublingen 1781. Collected Correspondence: Halle, 2 vols. 1769.
- Lavater, Joh. Caspar.*—Born in Zürich 1741, died January 1801. Collected Works, 3 vols. large 8vo: Augsburg and Lindau, 1834–36.
- Leibnitz, G. W.*—Born in Leipzig 1646, died at Hanover 1716. Physics, Mathematics, Philosophy, Systematic Theology. Translated, large 8vo: Mainz, 1825. Theodike, an Essay on the Goodness of God, Human Freedom, &c.: Hanover, 1765.
- Lenz, Joh. Michael Reinhold.*—Born in Livonia 1750, became deranged and died at Moscow 1792. Collected Works by Tieck, 3 vols. 8vo: Berlin, 1828.
- Leisewitz, Johann Anton.*—Born at Hanover 1752, died at Brunswick 1806. Works: Vienna, 1817.
- Leopold, Friedrich.*—Born at Bramstadt in Holstein 1750, died 1819.
- Liscov, Christoph Fried.*—Born in Mecklenburg 1701, died in prison at Eilenburg 1760. Collection of Satirical and Serious Essays: Frank. and Leip. 1739, 8vo. Completed with Notices of his Life by Müller: Berlin, 1806, 3 vols. 8vo.
- Lichtenberg, Georg. Christoph.*—Born at Ober Rannstädt in Darmstadt, died at Göttingen 1799. Explanations of Hogarth's Engravings: Göttingen, 1794. Miscellanies: Göttingen, 1800, 9 vols. 8vo.

- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim*.—Born at Camenz in Lusatia, died at Brunswick 1781. Collected Works by his brother, 30 vols. 8vo: Berlin, 1771–94.
- Löwen, Johann Fried.*—Born at Clausthal 1729, died at Rostock 1771. Complete Edition of his Works: Hamburg, 1765–6, 4 Parts, 8vo.
- Lohenstein, Daniel Kaspar von*.—Born at Niapsch 1635. Wrote the tragedy of Ibrahim Rassa at fifteen, travelled in Germany and the Netherlands, and became a Councillor of the Empire. Died as Syndic of Breslau 1683. Collected Works: Leipzig, 1733, 8vo.
- Luther, Martin*.—Born in Eisleben 1483, died in Eisleben and buried in Wittenberg. Augustinian Monk in Erfurt, 1505; Priest, 1507; Professor of Philosophy in Wittenberg, 1508; travelled to Rome and took his degree of Doctor in Theology, 1517. Collected Works, 22 vols. royal fol.: Leipzig, 1729–41. Another edition, German and Latin Introduction by Walch, 24 vols. 4to: Halle, 1740–51. Another edition, Erlangen, 26 vols. 1826–30. His great work is his Translation of the Bible, still universally used in the Protestant churches of Germany.
- Meiners, Christoph*.—Born at Otterndorf 1747, died at Göttingen 1810. Prof. in Göttingen. Philosophy and History.
- Miller, Johann Peter*.—Born at Leipheim 1725, died 1789. Complete Introduction to Theological Morals, Manuals, &c.
- Mendelssohn, Moses*.—Born at Dessau 1729, died in Berlin 1786. Collected Miscellaneous Writings for the Promotion of the Fine Arts, 6 vols. 8vo: Berlin, 1759–63.
- Meier, Georg Friedrich*.—Died as Professor in Halle 1777. Writings upon Taste and Belles Lettres, 3 vols.: Halle, 1769.
- Mastallier, Karl*.—Born in Vienna 1751, died same place 1795. Poems and Odes from Horace: Vienna, 1782, 8vo.
- Manso, Johann Kaspar Fried.*—Born at Zella in Gotha 1759, died at Breslau 1826. Miscellaneous, 2 vols.: Leipzig, 1801.
- Meissner, August Gottlieb*.—Born at Bauzen, 1753, died at Fulda 1807.
- Mathison, Friedrich von*.—Born near Magdeburg 1761. Works, 8 vols.: Zürich, 1829. Remains, 4 vols.: Berlin, 1832.
- Michaelis, Johann Benjamin*.—Born at Zittau 1746, died at Halberstadt 1772. Correspondence, Songs, Satires, &c., &c.
- Michaelis, Johann Hein.* (father of the above).—Born at Hohenstein 1663, died 1728. Professor of Oriental Languages and Theology in Halle.
- Michaelis, Joh. Dan.*—Born Halle 1717, died Göttingen 1791. Professor, Critic, Orientalist and Theologian.
- Mosheim, J. L. von*.—Born at Lubeck 1694, died at Helmstadt 1755. Complete Ecclesiastical History, continued by J. R. Schlegel, 7 vols. large 8vo: Heilbronn, 1786–96. Elementary, Dogmatical, Theological, and numerous other works. Morality of Scripture: Helmstadt, 1735, 4 vols., with continuation by J. P. Miller, 7 vols.
- Moritz, Karl Philipp*.—Born at Hameln 1757, died in Berlin 1793. Professor of the Arts in Berlin. Grammar, Æsthetics, Archæology. His own Life in the Novel ‘Anton Keiser.’
- Möser, Justus*.—Born at Osnabruck 1720, died same place 1794. Collected Works, 8 vols. 8vo: Berlin, 1798.

- Moser, Karl Friedrich von.*—Born at Stuttgart 1725, died at Ludwigsburg 1798. Works not collected.
- Miller, Johann Martin.*—Born at Ulm 1750, died same place 1814. Works not collected. Siegwart, 3 vols.: Leipzig, 1777. Correspondence, &c.
- Müller, Johannes von.*—Born at Schaffhausen 1752, died at Cassel 1809. Collected Works: Tübingen, 1810.
- Müller, Johann Gottswerth.*—Born in Hamburg 1744, died at Itzehoe 1828. Numerous Tales and Novels, not collected.
- Müller, Friedrich August.*—Born in Vienna 1767, died 1807. Richard Löwenherz, 7 books, 8vo: Berlin, 1790. Alfonso, 8 cantos: Göttingen, 8vo, 1790. Adelbert der Milde, 12 cantos, 2 vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1793.
- Müller, F. C.* (called the Painter).—Born at Kreuznach 1750. Artist, Poet.
- Müller, Johann Ernest.*—Born at Altenberg 1766. Novelist.
- Musæus, Johann Karl August.*—Born in Jena 1735, died at Weimar 1787. Novels and tales of imagination.
- Neukirch, Benjamin.*—Born at Reinke in Silesia. Originally a Lawyer, then Professor and Tutor of the nobility, and in the family of the Prince of Anspach, where he died 1729. Prince of Ithaca or Telemachus: Anspach, 1727–39, 3 vols. folio. Collected Poems by Gottsched: Ratisbon, 8vo, 1744.
- Nicolai, Christoph Friedrich.*—Born in Berlin 1733, died there 1811. Collected Miscellaneous Writings for the Promotion of the Fine Arts, 6 vols.: Berlin, 1759–63.
- Novalis, Friedrich Lud. von Hardenberg.*—Born at Wiedersdorf near Mansfeld, died at Weissenfels 1801. Collected Works by Schlegel and Tieck, 2 vols. 4to: Berlin, 1826.
- Opitz, Martin von Boberfeld.*—Born at Buntzlau 1579, died in Danzig 1639. Ennobled by the Emperor. Founder of the Modern School of German Poetry; his first followers were especially Silesians, and his school was called the Silesian School. See Life of Opitz in Schlegel's 'German Museum,' ii. pp. 116–157. He first wrote his 'Aristarchus' in Latin. Poetical Works: Breslau, 4to, 1624. Best edition: Breslau, 1690, 3 vols. 8vo. With a new Title: Frankfort and Leipzig, 1724.
- Paulus, H. E. G.*—Born at Lemberg in Würtemberg 1760, still alive. New Testament: Leipzig, 3 vols. 1812. Life of Christ, History, Exegesis, Philosophy, Oriental Languages, Ecclesiastical History. Above 30 works. Professor in Heidelberg.
- Pestalozzi, H.*—Son of a physician in Zürich. Born 1746. Inquiries into the Course of Nature and the development of the Human Race, 8vo: Zürich, 1797, and other works. The Founder of the well-known system called by his name.
- Pfenninger, Joh. Konrad.*—Born at Zürich 1747, died 1792. Repertorium for Believers of all Confessions, 8vo: Zürich, 1784–86. Jewish Letters, Narratives, &c.
- Pfeffel, Gottlieb Conrad.*—Born at Colmar 1736, died 1809. Poetical Works, 10 vols.: Stuttgart and Basle, 1802–21. Prose Works, 10 vols.: Stuttgart and Basle, 1810–12.

- Plank, G. J.*—Born at Nürtinger in Württemberg. Professor of Theology, Göttingen. Ecclesiastical History, Dogmatics, Theology, Encyclopædia, Pastoral Theology, &c.
- Plutner, Friedrich.*—Born in Leipzig 1730, died 1770. *Historia Juris Scientiæ Civilis Romæ et Byzantinæ*. 8vo: Lipsiæ, 1760. *De Legibus Romanorum*, and other works.
- Postel, C. H.*—Born in Hadeln 1683, died at Hamburg 1705. Epic Poet. Author of 'Wittekind the Great' and 'The Artful Juno.' The latter was intended as a specimen of a paraphrastic translation of Homer; the former was left incomplete, and was so published, in 8vo, by Weichman: Hamburg, 1724. The former was the first attempt among the Germans to translate Homer. It was printed in Hamburg in 8vo, 1700, with a Preface on the Life of Homer.
- Posselt, Ernst Ludwig.*—Born at Durlach 1763, died at Heidelberg 1804. Professor of History in Carlsruhe. *Historical Taschenbücher*, &c.
- Puffendorf, Samuel.*—*De Jure Nat. et Gent. Libri viii. De Officiis Humanis*, &c.
- Pütter, Johann Stephen.*—Born at Iserlohn 1725, died 1786. Autobiography, 2 vols. 8vo: Göttingen. History, Ecclesiastical and Civil Law, Law of Nations, Roman and German Law; above 50 different works.
- Pyra, Jacob Immanuel.*—Born at Cothbus 1715, died in Berlin 1744.
- Rubener, Gottlieb Wilhelm.*—Born at Wachau near Leipzig 1714, died in Dresden 1771. *Collected Works*, with Life by Weisse, 6 vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1772.
- Ramler, Karl Wilhelm.*—Born at Colberg 1725, died in Berlin 1798. *Collected Works*, 2 vols. 4to: Berlin, 1800.
- Reinhard, Franz Wolkmar.*—Born at Bohnenstrauss in the Upper Palatinate 1753, died in Dresden 1812. 34 vols. *Sermons* from 1795–1812. Philosophy, Dogmatics.
- Reimarus, H. G.*—Born in Hamburg 1694, died 1786. *Instincts of Animals*, 2 vols. 8vo: Hamburg, 1798. *Theory of Pure Reason*, *Natural Religion*, &c.
- Reiske, Johann Jakob.*—Born at Zördig 1710, died 1774. *Animad. ad Autores Græcos*, 5 vols. 8vo: Lipsiæ, 1757–66. *Conjecturæ in Jobum*, &c.: Lipsiæ, 1799, and other works.
- Resewitz, F. G.*—Born Berlin 1725, died Magdeburg 1806. *Sermons for Youth*, 2 vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1779–82.
- Riedel, F. G.*—Born near Erfurt 1742, died 1785. *Philosophical Library*, 4 parts, large 8vo: Halle, 1768–9.
- Rochow, Fried. Eberhard von.*—Born in Berlin 1734, died at Halberstadt 1805. Prebend of Halberstadt, &c.
- Salzmann, Christian Gottlieb.*—Born at Sommerda near Erfurt 1744, died 1811. The Founder of the Institution in Schnepfenthal, yet renowned as a school for youth.
- Sailer, J. M.*—Born at Artsing 1751. *Connexion of Philosophy with Religion and Dogmatics*, *Sermons*, *Homilies*, *Remains of the Fathers*, *Principles of the Catholic Church*, &c.

- Schelling, F. W. J. von.*—Born at Leonberg in Würtemberg 1775. Professor of Philosophy in Jena, Munich, and now in Berlin. The great Coryphæus of the pietist movement, and the reliance of his party for the combination of philosophy with orthodoxy.
- Salis, Johann Gaudenz von.*—Born at Leewis in the Grisons 1762. Poems: Zürich, 1835.
- Schweighäuser.*—Born in Strasburg 1742, died 1830. Philological Editor, Lexicographer and Commentator. Professor in Strasburg.
- Semler, Io. Salomon.*—Born at Saalfeld 1725, died Professor in Halle 1791. Hermeneutics, Dogmatics, Ecclesiastical History, Philosophy, &c. Above 50 works.
- Schatz, Georg.*—Born at Gotha 1763, died same place 1795. Dramatist.
- Schlegel, Johann Elias.*—Born at Meissen 1718, died in Denmark 1749. Dramatist, President of the Ritter Academy in Soröe.
- Schlegel, I. Adolf.*—Born at Meissen 1721, died at Hanover 1743. Lyric Poet.
- Schmidt, Michael Ignaz.*—Born at Arnstein in Wurzburg 1736, died in Vienna 1794. History of Germany, 22 vols.: Ulm, 1785–1808.
- Schlözer, August Ludwig von.*—Born at Iagstadt in Hohenlohe 1735, died at Göttingen 1809.
- Schubart, Christian Friedrich Daniel.*—Born at Obersontheim in Swabia 1739, died at Stuttgart 1791. Poems, 3 vols. 8vo: Frankfort, 1829.
- Schiller, Friedrich von.*—Born at Marbach in Wurtemberg 1759, died at Weimar 1805. Collected Works, 12 vols. 8vo: Stuttgart, 1812.
- Schöniach, Christoph Otto von.*—Born at Amtitz in Lusatia, died 1807. Works not collected.
- Schlosser, Johann Ludwig.*—Born in Hamburg 1738. Works, 6 vols. 8vo: Basle and Frankfort, 1780–94.
- Schröck, Johann Matthias.*—Born in Vienna 1733, died at Wittemberg 1808. His Ecclesiastical History appeared in Frankfort and Leipzig from 1–35 parts, from 1768–88, and other works.
- Schmid, Konrad Arnold.*—Born at Lüneburg 1716, died at Brunswick 1789.
- Schmidt, Klammer.*—Born in Halberstadt 1746, died 1822. Elegiac Poetry.
- Sievers, G. I. P.*—Born in Brunswick 1775. Writer on Æsthetics and Dramatist.
- Spener, Philipp James.*—Born at Rappoltsweiler in Alsace 1635, died as Consistorial Councillor and Provost in Berlin 1705. One of the great founders of the Pietist school.
- Spalding, J. J.*—Born at Triebsees in Pomerania 1714, died in Berlin 1804. Destinies of Man, 8vo: Leipzig, 1794. Sermons and other works.
- Stolberg, Fried. Lud. Graf zu, and Graf Christoph zu Stolberg.*—Collected Works of the two brothers Stolberg: Hamburg, 20 vols. 8vo, 1821.
- Sprickman, Anton Matthias.*—Born at Munster 1769.

- Stattler, Benjamin*.—Demonstr. Catholica. Ethica Christiana Communis. Ethica Universalis. Theol. Christ. Theoretica, &c.
- Spittler, Ludwig Timotheus von*.—Born at Stuttgart 1752, died 1810.
- Sturz, Helfreich Peter*.—Born in Darmstadt 1736, died in Bremen 1779. Philosophy of History: Riga, 4 vols. 4to. 1784.
- Sulzer, Johann Georg*.—Born at Winterthur in Switzerland 1720, died in Berlin 1779. General Theory of the Beautiful, 4 vols.: Leipzig, 1792-9.
- Töllner, J. G.*—System of Dogmatics, 2 vols.: Nuremberg, 1775. Sermons, Pastoral Theology, Inspiration, &c. Died 1774.
- Teller, Wilhelm Abraham*.—Born at Leipzig 1734, died in Berlin 1804. President of the Consistory. Exegesis. Ecclesiastical History.
- Thomasius, Christian*.—Born at Leipzig 1665. Professor of Law. Founder and Director of the University of Halle, 1728. The first who read lectures to his students in German. Chief works are Theological and Legal.
- Thümmel, Moritz August von*.—Born at Schönfeld near Leipzig, died 1817. Travels in the South of France: Wilhelmine, 1768. Collected Works, 6 vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1811-19.
- Törting, Joseph August Graf von*.—Born in Munich 1753, died same place 1826.
- Triller, Daniel Wilhelm*.—Born near Erfurt 1695. Medicine.
- Uz, Johann Peter*.—Born at Anspach 1720, died same place 1796. Collected Works by Weisse, 2 vols. 4to: Vienna, 1824.
- Voss, Johann Heinrich*.—Born at Sommersdorf in Mecklenburg 1751, died at Heidelberg 1826. Collected Poems by Abraham Voss, 1 vol. 4to: Leipzig, 1839. Criticism, 2 vols.: Stuttgart. Königsberg, 8 vols. 1802. Correspondence, 3 vols.: Halberstadt, 1833. Translator of Shakespeare, Homer, &c.
- Voss, Heinrich*.—Born Otterndorf 1779, died Weimar 1822. Son of the former; also a Professor, Poet and Critic. Editor of his father's Translations, &c.
- Weber, Karl Jul.*—Born at Langenburg 1767, died at Kupferzelle 1830. Belles Lettres.
- Weise, Christian*.—Born at Zittau 1642. Professor and Rector of the Gymnasium at Weissenfels, where he died 1708. Poet, Critic, Novelist. His Spiritual Songs have appeared in several collections. Budissin 1719-20.
- Wernicke, Wernigh or Wernack*.—A Prussian. Year of his birth unknown. Studied at Kiel; Secretary to the Embassy in England. Died in the Danish service in Paris between 1710-20.
- Wezel, Johann Karl*.—Born at Sonderhausen 1747, became deranged and died 1819. Works not collected. Correspondence, Dramas, Essays, &c.
- Wieland, Christ. Martin*.—Born at Biberach in Swabia 1733, died at Weimar 1813. Moral Tales: Heilbron, 1762. Comic Tales: Zürich, 1768. Grecian Tales: Leipzig, 1784-87. Collected Works, 39 vols. and 6 supplemental vols. 8vo: Leipzig, 1794-1802.
- Winklemann, Johann*.—Born at Stendal 1717, murdered at Trieste 1768. Collected Works by Eiselein, 12 vols. 8vo: Donauschingen.

- Zachariä, Friedrich Wilhelm*.—Born at Frankenhäusen 1726, died at Brunswick 1777. Collected Poems: Brunswick, 1777, in 2 vols.
- Zedlitz, Karl Abr. von*.—Born at Schwarzwald in Silesia 1731.
- Ziegler, H. A. von and Kliphausen*.—Born in Upper Lusatia 1653, died 1690.
- Zimmerman, Georg*.—Born at Brugg in Switzerland 1728, died at Hanover 1795.

END OF VOL. II.



University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

REC'D LD-URL

FEB 09 1998

ON THE 8/11

20

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 291 362 2

